J. STALIN

WORKS

3

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/jvstalinworks0003jvst

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

Russian Edition
Published by Decision
of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union
(Bolsheviks)

Пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь!

ИНСТИТУТ МАРКСА — ЭНГЕЛЬСА — ЛЕНИНА при ЦК ВКП(б)

И.В.СТАЛИН

СОЧИНЕНИЯ

★

ОГИЗ
ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ
Москва • 1946

J. V. STALIN

WORKS

VOLUME 3

1917

MARCH – OCTOBER

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
Moscow • 1954

J. V. STALIN

WORKS

VOLUME

3

1917

MARCH–OCTOBER

CONTENTS

Page

Preface XIII

1917

THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES 1

THE WAR 4

BIDDING FOR MINISTERIAL PORTFOLIOS . . . 10

CONDITIONS FOR THE VICTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION 12

ABOLITION OF NATIONAL DISABILITIES 17

EITHER—OR 22

AGAINST FEDERALISM 25

TWO RESOLUTIONS. 34

THE LAND TO THE PEASANTS 36

MAY DAY 39

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. *Speech Delivered at a Meeting in Vasilyevsky Ostrov, April 18 (May 1), 1917* 41

THE CONFERENCE IN THE MARIINSKY PALACE . 46

THE SEVENTH (APRIL) CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS), *April 24-29, 1917* . . 51

1. Speech in Support of Comrade Lenin's Resolution on the Current Situation, *April 24* 51

2. Report on the National Question, *April 29* . . . 52

3. Reply to the Discussion on the National Question, *April 29* 58

LAGGING BEHIND THE REVOLUTION 61

WHAT DID WE EXPECT FROM THE CONFERENCE? 67

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN 70

YESTERDAY AND TODAY (*Crisis of the Revolution*) . 84

AGAINST ISOLATED DEMONSTRATIONS 92

RESULTS OF THE PETROGRAD MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS 95

TO ALL THE TOILERS, TO ALL THE WORKERS AND SOLDIERS OF PETROGRAD 101

AT THE DEMONSTRATION 105

CLOSE THE RANKS! 110

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT AN EMERGENCY CONFERENCE OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS), *July 16-20, 1917*. 114

1. Report of the Central Committee on the July Events, *July 16* 114
2. Report on the Current Situation, *July 16* . . . 121
3. Replies to Written Questions, *July 16* 129
4. Reply to the Discussion, *July 16* 131

WHAT HAS HAPPENED? 134

VICTORY OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION . . . 138

THE VICTORY OF THE CADETS 142

TO ALL THE TOILERS, TO ALL THE WORKERS AND SOLDIERS OF PETROGRAD 145

TWO CONFERENCES 153

THE NEW GOVERNMENT 155
THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS . . . 158
SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS), *July 26-August 3, 1917* 166
1. Report of the Central Committee, *July 27* . . . 166
2. Reply to the Discussion, *July 27* 179
3. Report on the Political Situation, *July 30* . . 182
4. Replies to Questions in Connection With the Report on the Political Situation, *July 31* . . 190
5. Reply to the Discussion, *July 31* 195
6. Reply to Preobrazhensky on Clause 9 of the Resolution "On the Political Situation," *August 3* . 199
WHAT DO THE CAPITALISTS WANT? 201
AGAINST THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE 207
MORE ON THE SUBJECT OF STOCKHOLM 211
WHITHER THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE? 215
COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA 221
TWO COURSES 226
OUTCOME OF THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE 231
THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR DEFEAT AT THE FRONT . 234
THE CAUSES OF THE JULY DEFEAT AT THE FRONT. 238
WHO REALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEFEAT AT THE FRONT? 245
AMERICAN BILLIONS 250
THIS IS ELECTION DAY 254
A PERIOD OF PROVOCATION 260
DIVISION OF LABOUR IN THE "SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARY" PARTY 263

YELLOW ALLIANCE 267
EITHER—OR 271
WE DEMAND! 277
THE CONSPIRACY CONTINUES 282
AGAINST COMPROMISE WITH THE BOURGEOISIE . 287
THE CRISIS AND THE DIRECTORY 289
THEY WILL NOT SWERVE FROM THEIR PATH . . 293
THE BREAK WITH THE CADETS 296
THE SECOND WAVE 301
FOREIGNERS AND THE KORNILOV CONSPIRACY . 308
THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE 311
TWO LINES 316
ALL POWER TO THE SOVIETS! 320
THE REVOLUTIONARY FRONT 323
FORGING CHAINS 328
A GOVERNMENT OF BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP . 332
COMMENTS 336
The Railway Strike and the Democratic Bankrupts 336
The Russian Peasants and the Party of Numskulls 338
CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE WORKERS 340
YOU WILL WAIT IN VAIN! 343
COMMENTS 347
The Party of "Indeterminates" and the Russian Soldiers 347
Conspirators in Power 349

A PAPER COALITION 351

COMMENTS 354

Starvation in the Countryside 354

Starvation in the Factories 355

SELF-CHASTISEMENT 358

THE PLOT AGAINST THE REVOLUTION 361

WHO IS TORPEDOING THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY? 383

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION IS MOBILISING—PREPARE TO RESIST! 386

WHO NEEDS THE PRE-PARLIAMENT? 389

SOVIET POWER 392

A STUDY IN BRAZENNESS 397

BLACKLEGS OF THE REVOLUTION 401

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, *October 16, 1917* 407

"STRONG BULLS OF BASHAN HAVE BESET ME ROUND" 409

WHAT DO WE NEED? 414

Notes 418

Biographical Chronicle (March-October 1917) 440

PREFACE

The third volume contains the major works of J. V. Stalin relating to the preparatory period of the Great Socialist Revolution of October 1917.

J. V. Stalin worked in 1917 in close fellowship with V. I. Lenin, directing the Bolshevik Party and the working class in its struggle for the conquest of governmental power.

An important place in the works contained in the volume is given to the question of Bolshevik leadership of the masses at the time of the June and July demonstrations and of the elections to the Petrograd district and city Dumas (the appeal "To All the Toilers, to All the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd," and the articles "Against Isolated Demonstrations," "The Municipal Election Campaign," "What Has Happened?" "Close the Ranks!" "This Is Election Day," etc.), at the time of the action to defeat Kornilov's counter-revolutionary attempt ("We Demand!" "The Conspiracy Continues," "Foreigners and the Kornilov Conspiracy," etc.), and in the period of direct preparation for the armed uprising, September-October 1917 ("The Democratic Conference," "Two Lines," "You Will Wait in Vain!" "The Counter-revolution Is

Mobilising—Prepare to Resist!" "Forging Chains," "A Study in Brazenness," etc.).

A number of the works in the volume deal with the struggle of the Party to convert the Soviets from organs for the mobilisation of the masses into organs of revolt and of proletarian rule (reports at the Emergency Conference of the Petrograd organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) and at the Sixth Congress of the Party, and the articles "All Power to the Soviets!" "Soviet Power," "Blacklegs of the Revolution," "What Do We Need?").

Most of the articles in this volume were reprinted in the book, *On the Road to October*, published in 1925 in two editions. They were first printed in the Central Organ of the Bolshevik Party, *Pravda*, which also appeared under other names—*Proletary*, *Rabochy*, *Rabochy Put*—as well as in the Bolshevik papers, *Soldatskaya Pravda*, *Proletarskoye Delo*, *Rabochy i Soldat*, etc.

Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute
of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.)

1917

MARCH–OCTOBER

THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

The chariot of the Russian revolution is advancing with lightning speed. The detachments of revolutionary militants are everywhere growing and spreading. The pillars of the old power are tottering on their foundations and crumbling. Now, as always, Petrograd is in the forefront. Behind it, stumbling at times, trail the immense provinces.

The forces of the old power are crumbling, but they are not yet destroyed. They are only lying low, waiting for a favourable moment to raise their head and fling themselves on free Russia. Glance around and you will see that the sinister work of the dark forces is going on incessantly. . . .

The rights won must be upheld so as to destroy completely the old forces and, in conjunction with the provinces, further advance the Russian revolution—such should be the next immediate task of the proletariat of the capital.

But how is this to be done ?

What is needed to achieve this?

In order to *shatter* the old power a temporary alliance between the insurrectionary workers and soldiers was enough. For it is self-evident that the strength of the

Russian revolution lies in an alliance between the workers and the peasants clad in soldier's uniform.

But in order to *preserve* the rights achieved and to *develop further* the revolution, a *temporary* alliance between the workers and soldiers is far from enough.

For this it is necessary that the alliance should be made conscious and secure, lasting and stable, sufficiently stable to withstand the provocative assaults of the counter-revolutionaries. For it is clear to all that the guarantee of the final victory of the Russian revolution lies in consolidating the alliance between the revolutionary workers and the revolutionary soldiers.

The organs of this alliance are the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

And the more closely these Soviets are welded together and the more strongly they are organised, the more effective will be the revolutionary power of the revolutionary people which they express, and the more reliable will be the guarantees against counter-revolution.

The revolutionary Social-Democrats must work to consolidate these Soviets, form them everywhere, and link them together under a Central Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies as the organ of revolutionary power of the people.

Workers, close your ranks and rally around the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party!

Peasants, organise in peasant unions and rally around the revolutionary proletariat, the leader of the Russian revolution!

Soldiers, organise in unions of your own and gather around the Russian people, the only true ally of the Russian revolutionary army!

Workers, peasants and soldiers, unite everywhere in Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, as organs of alliance and power of the revolutionary forces of Russia!

Therein lies the guarantee of complete victory over the dark forces of old Russia.

Therein lies the guarantee that the fundamental demands of the Russian people will be realised: land for the peasants, protection of labour for the workers, and a democratic republic for all the citizens of Russia!

Pravda, No. 8,
March 14, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

THE WAR

The other day General Kornilov informed the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies that the Germans were planning an offensive against Russia.

Rodzyanko and Guchkov took advantage of the opportunity to appeal to the army and the people to prepare to fight the war to a finish.

And the bourgeois press sounded the alarm: "Liberty is in danger! Long live the war!" Moreover, a section of the Russian revolutionary democracy took a hand in raising the alarm. . . .

To listen to the alarmists, one might think that the situation of Russia today resembles that of France in 1792, when the reactionary monarchs of Central and Eastern Europe formed an alliance against republican France with the object of restoring the old regime in that country.

And if the external situation of Russia today really did correspond to that of France in 1792, if we really were faced with a specific coalition of counter-revolutionary monarchs whose specific purpose it was to restore the old regime in Russia, there can be no doubt that

the Social-Democrats, like the French revolutionaries of that period, would rise up as one man in defence of liberty. For it is self-evident that liberty won at the price of blood must be safeguarded by force of arms against all counter-revolutionary assaults, from whatever quarter they may proceed.

But is this really the case?

The war of 1792 was a dynastic war fought by absolute feudal monarchs against republican France, because they were terrified of the revolutionary conflagration in that country. The aim of the war was to extinguish the conflagration, restore the old order in France, and thus guarantee the scared monarchs against the spread of the revolutionary contagion to their own countries. It was for this reason that the French revolutionaries fought the armies of the monarchs so heroically.

But this is not the case with the present war. The present war is an imperialist war. Its principal aim is the seizure (annexation) of foreign, chiefly agrarian, territories by capitalistically developed states. The latter need new markets, convenient communications with these markets, raw materials and mineral wealth, and they endeavour to secure them everywhere, regardless of the internal regimes in the countries they seek to annex.

This explains why, generally speaking, the present war does not, and cannot, lead necessarily to interference in the internal affairs of the territories annexed, in the sense of restoring their old regimes.

And precisely for this reason the present situation of Russia provides no warrant for sounding the alarm

and proclaiming: "Liberty is in danger! Long live the war!"

It would be truer to say that the present situation of Russia resembles that of the France of 1914, the France of the time of the outbreak of the war, of the time when war between Germany and France had become inevitable.

Just as in the bourgeois press of Russia today, so in the bourgeois camp of France at that time the alarm was sounded: "The Republic is in danger! Fight the Germans!"

And just as in France at that time the alarm spread to many of the Socialists (Guesde, Sembat, etc.), so now in Russia quite a number of Socialists are following in the footsteps of the bourgeois bellmen of "revolutionary defence."

The subsequent course of events in France showed that it was a false alarm, and that the cries about liberty and the Republic were a screen to cover up the fact that the French imperialists were lusting after Alsace-Lorraine and Westphalia.

We are profoundly convinced that the course of events in Russia will reveal the utter falsity of the immoderate howling that "liberty is in danger": the "patriotic" smoke-screen will disperse, and people will see for themselves that what the Russian imperialists are really after is—The Straits and Persia. . . .

The behaviour of Guesde, Sembat and their like was duly and authoritatively assessed in the anti-war resolutions of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal Socialist Congresses (1915-16).[1]

Subsequent events fully proved the correctness and fruitfulness of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal theses.

It would be deplorable if the Russian revolutionary democracy, which was able to overthrow the detested tsarist regime, were to succumb to the false alarm raised by the imperialist bourgeoisie and repeat the mistakes of Guesde and Sembat. . . .

What should be our attitude, as a party, to the present war?

What are the practical ways and means capable of leading to the speediest termination of the war?

First of all, it is unquestionable that the stark slogan, "Down with the war!" is absolutely unsuitable as a practical means, because, since it does not go beyond propaganda of the idea of peace in general, it does not and cannot provide anything capable of exerting practical influence on the belligerent forces to compel them to stop the war.

Further, one cannot but welcome yesterday's appeal of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to the peoples of the world, urging them to compel their respective governments to stop the slaughter. This appeal, if it reaches the broad masses, will undoubtedly bring back hundreds and thousands of workers to the forgotten slogan—"Workers of all countries, unite!" It must be observed, nevertheless, that it does not lead directly to the goal. For even assuming that the appeal becomes widely known among the peoples of the warring countries, it is hard to believe that they would act on it, seeing that they have not yet realised the predatory nature of the present war and its annexa-

tionist aims. We say nothing of the fact that, since the appeal makes the "cessation of the terrible slaughter" dependent upon the preliminary overthrow of the "semi-absolute regime" in Germany, it actually postpones the "cessation of the terrible slaughter" indefinitely, and thereby tends to espouse the position of a "war to a finish"; for no one can say exactly when the German people will succeed in overthrowing the "semi-absolute regime," or whether they will succeed at all in the near future. . . .

What, then, is the solution?

The solution is to bring pressure on the Provisional Government to make it declare its consent to start peace negotiations immediately.

The workers, soldiers and peasants must arrange meetings and demonstrations and demand that the Provisional Government shall *come out openly and publicly in an effort to induce all the belligerent powers to start peace negotiations immediately, on the basis of recognition of the right of nations to self-determination.*

Only then will the slogan "Down with the war!" not run the risk of being transformed into empty and meaningless pacifism; only then will it be capable of developing into a mighty political campaign which will unmask the imperialists and disclose the actual motives for the present war.

For even assuming that one of the sides refuses to negotiate on a given basis—even this refusal, that is, unwillingness to renounce annexationist ambitions, will objectively serve as a means of speeding the cessation of the "terrible slaughter," for then the peoples will be able to see for themselves the predatory character of

the war and the bloodstained countenance of the imperialist groups in whose rapacious interests they are sacrificing the lives of their sons.

But unmasking the imperialists and opening the eyes of the masses to the real motives for the present war actually is declaring war on war and rendering the present war impossible.

Pravda, No. 10,
March 16, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

BIDDING FOR MINISTERIAL PORTFOLIOS

A few days ago resolutions on the Provisional Government, on the war, and on unity passed by the Yedinstvo group[2] were published in the press.

This is the Plekhanov-Buryanov group, a "defencist" group.

To understand the character of this group, it is enough to know that in its opinion:

1) "The necessary democratic control over the actions of the Provisional Government can best be achieved by the *participation* of the working-class democracy in the Provisional Government";

2) "The proletariat must *continue* the war"—among other reasons, in order "to deliver Europe from the menace of Austro-German reaction."

In brief, what they are demanding of the workers is: Send your hostages, gentlemen, into the Guchkov-Milyukov Provisional Government and be so kind as to continue the war for—the seizure of Constantinople!

That is the slogan of the Plekhanov-Buryanov group.

And, after that, this group has the hardihood to appeal to the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party to unite with it!

The worthies of the Yedinstvo group forget that the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party stands by the Zimmerwald-Kienthal resolutions, which repudiate both defencism and participation in the present government, even if it is a provisional one (not to be confused with a *revolutionary* provisional government!).

They fail to realise that Zimmerwald and Kienthal were a repudiation of Guesde and Sembat, and, conversely, that unity with Guchkov and Milyukov precludes unity with the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. . . .

They overlooked the fact that for a long time already Liebknecht and Scheidemann have not been living together, and cannot live together, in one party. . . .

No, sirs, you have addressed your unity appeal to the wrong quarter!

One may, of course, make a bid for Ministerial portfolios, one may unite with Milyukov and Guchkov for the purpose of—"continuing the war" and so on. All this is a matter of taste. But what has it got to do with the Russian Social-Democratic Party, and why unite with it?

No, sirs, go your way!

Pravda, No. 11,
March 17, 1917

Unsigned

CONDITIONS FOR THE VICTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The revolution is on the march. From Petrograd, where it started, it is spreading to the provinces and is gradually embracing all the boundless expanses of Russia. More, from political questions it is inevitably passing to social questions, to the question of improving the lot of the workers and peasants, thereby deepening and sharpening the present crisis.

All this cannot but arouse anxiety among definite circles of property-owning Russia. Tsarist-landlord reaction is raising its head. The imperialist clique are sounding the alarm. The financial bourgeoisie are extending a hand to the obsolescent feudal aristocracy with a view to joint organisation of counter-revolution. Today they are still weak and irresolute, but tomorrow they may grow stronger and mobilise against the revolution. At all events, they are carrying on their sinister work incessantly, rallying forces from all sections of the population, not excluding the army. . . .

How can the incipient counter-revolution be curbed?

What conditions are necessary for the victory of the Russian revolution?

It is one of the peculiarities of our revolution that to this day its base is Petrograd. The clashes and shots,

the barricades and casualties, the struggle and victory took place chiefly in Petrograd and its environs (Kronstadt, etc.). The provinces have confined themselves to accepting the fruits of victory and expressing confidence in the Provisional Government.

A reflection of this fact is that dual power, that actual division of power between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which is the cause of so much anxiety to the hirelings of counter-revolution. On the one hand, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which is an organ of revolutionary struggle of the workers and soldiers, and, on the other, the Provisional Government, which is an organ of the moderate bourgeoisie, who are scared by the "excesses" of the revolution and have found a prop in the inertia of the provinces—such is the picture.

Therein lies the weakness of the revolution, because such a state of affairs perpetuates the isolation of the provinces from the capital, the lack of contact between them.

But, as the revolution goes deeper, the provinces too are being revolutionised. Soviets of Workers' Deputies are being formed in the localities. The peasants are being drawn into the movement and are organising their own unions. The army is becoming democratised and soldiers' unions are being organised in the military units. The inertia of the provinces is receding into the past.

Thus the ground is trembling under the feet of the Provisional Government.

At the same time, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Deputies is also becoming inadequate for the new situation.

What is needed is an all-Russian organ of revolutionary struggle of the democracy of all Russia, one authoritative enough to weld together the democracy of the capital and the provinces and to transform itself at the required moment from an organ of revolutionary *struggle* of the people into an organ of revolutionary *power*, which will mobilise all the vital forces of the people against counter-revolution.

Only an All-Russian Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies can be such an organ.

This is the first condition for the victory of the Russian revolution.

Further, along with its bad sides, the war, like everything in life, has a good side, which is that by mobilising practically the whole adult population of Russia, it has given the army the character of a people's army, and has thus facilitated the work of uniting the soldiers with the insurrectionary workers. This, in fact, explains the comparative ease with which the revolution broke out and triumphed in our country.

But the army is mobile and fluid, particularly owing to its constant movements from one place to another in conformity with the requirements of war. The army cannot remain permanently in one place and protect the revolution from counter-revolution. Consequently, another armed force is needed, an army of armed workers who are naturally connected with the centres of the revolutionary movement. And if it is true that a revolution cannot win without an armed force that is ready to serve it at all times, then our revolution too must have its own force—a workers' guard vitally bound up with the cause of the revolution.

Thus a second condition for the victory of the revolution is the immediate arming of the workers—a workers' guard.

A characteristic feature of the revolutionary movements, in France for example, was the indubitable fact that the provisional governments there usually arose on the barricades, and were therefore revolutionary, or at any rate more revolutionary than the constituent assemblies they subsequently convoked, which usually met after the "tranquilisation" of the country. This, indeed, explains why the more experienced revolutionaries of those times tried to get their programme carried through with the help of a revolutionary government, and before the convocation of a constituent assembly, by delaying its convocation. Their idea was to confront the constituent assembly with already accomplished reforms.

That is not the case in our country, where the Provisional Government arose not *on* the barricades, but *near* the barricades. That is why it is not revolutionary—it is only being dragged along in the tail of the revolution, unwillingly and getting in its way. And judging from the fact that the revolution is growing ever more profound, is putting forward social demands—the eight-hour day and confiscation of the land—and is revolutionising the provinces, it may be confidently said that the future Popular Constituent Assembly will be much more democratic than the present Provisional Government, which was elected by the Duma of June the Third.

Moreover, it is to be feared that the Provisional Government, scared as it is by the sweep of the revolution and imbued with imperialist tendencies, *may*, in

certain political circumstances, serve as a "lawful" shield and screen for the counter-revolution that is organising.

The convocation of a Constituent Assembly should therefore not be delayed under any circumstances.

In view of this, it is necessary to convene a Constituent Assembly as speedily as possible, as the only institution which will enjoy authority in the eyes of all sections of society and be capable of crowning the work of the revolution, thereby clipping the wings of the rising counter-revolution.

Thus a third condition for the victory of the revolution is the speedy convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

A general condition for all these necessary measures is the opening of peace negotiations as speedily as possible and the termination of this inhuman war, because continuation of the war, with the financial, economic and food crisis it brings in its train, is that submerged reef on which the ship of revolution may be wrecked.

Pravda, No. 12,
March 18, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

ABOLITION OF NATIONAL DISABILITIES

One of the ulcers that disgraced the old Russia was national oppression.

Religious and national persecution, forcible Russification of the "alien" peoples, suppression of national-cultural institutions, denial of the franchise, denial of liberty of movement, incitement of nationality against nationality, pogroms and massacres—such was the national oppression of shameful memory.

How can national oppression be eliminated?

The social basis of national oppression, the force which animates it, is the obsolescent landed aristocracy. And the nearer the latter is to power and the firmer it grasps it, the more severe is national oppression and the more revolting are its forms.

In the old Russia, when the old feudal landed aristocracy was in power, national oppression operated to the limit, not infrequently taking the form of pogroms (of Jews) and massacres (Armenian-Tatar).

In Britain, where the landed aristocracy (the landlords) share power with the bourgeoisie and have long since ceased to exercise undivided rule, national oppression is milder, less inhuman—if, of course, we disregard

the fact that in the course of this war, when power has passed into the hands of the landlords, national oppression has become much more severe (persecution of the Irish, the Indians).

And in Switzerland and North America, where landlordism has never existed and the bourgeoisie enjoys undivided power, the nationalities develop more or less freely, and, generally speaking, there is practically no soil for national oppression.

This is to be explained chiefly by the fact that, owing to its very position, the landed aristocracy is (cannot but be!) the most determined and implacable foe of all liberty, national liberty included; that liberty in general, and national liberty in particular, undermines (cannot but undermine!) the very foundations of the political rule of the landed aristocracy.

Thus the way to put an end to national oppression and to create the *actual* conditions necessary for national liberty is to drive the feudal aristocracy from the political stage, to wrest the power from its hands.

Inasmuch as the Russian revolution has triumphed, it has already created these actual conditions, having overthrown the power of the feudal serfowners and established liberty.

What is now necessary is:

1) to define the rights of the nationalities emancipated from oppression, and

2) to confirm them by legislation.

This is the soil from which sprang the Provisional Government's decree on the abolition of religious and national disabilities.

Spurred by the growth of the revolution, the Provisional Government was bound to take this first step towards the emancipation of the peoples of Russia; and it did take it.

The decree amounts in general substance to the abolition of restrictions on the rights of citizens of non-Russian nationality and not belonging to the Orthodox Church in respect to: 1) settlement, domicile and movement; 2) acquisition of property rights, etc.; 3) engaging in any occupation, in trade, etc.; 4) participation in joint-stock and other societies; 5) entering the government service, etc.; 6) enrolling in educational institutions; 7) use of languages and dialects other than Russian in the transaction of the affairs of private associations, in tuition in private educational establishments of all kinds, and in commercial accountancy.

Such is the Provisional Government's decree.

The peoples of Russia who were hitherto under suspicion may now breathe freely and feel they are citizens of Russia.

This is all very good.

But it would be an unpardonable mistake to think that this decree is sufficient to guarantee national liberty, that emancipation from national oppression is already fully accomplished.

In the first place, the decree does not establish national equality in respect to language. The last clause of the decree speaks of the right to use languages other than Russian in the transaction of the affairs of *private* associations and in tuition in *private* educational establishments. But what about the regions with compact

majorities of non-Russian citizens whose language is not Russian (Transcaucasia, Turkestan, the Ukraine, Lithuania, etc.)? There is no doubt that they will have (must have!) their parliaments, and hence will have "affairs" (by no means "private"!) and "tuition" in educational establishments (not only "private"!)—and all this, of course, not only in Russian, but also in the local languages. Is it the idea of the Provisional Government to proclaim Russian the state language and to *deprive these regions of the right to conduct "affairs" and "tuition" in their native languages in their, by no means "private," institutions*? Apparently, it is. But who but simpletons can believe that this signifies complete equalisation of the rights of nations, about which the bourgeois gossips of *Rech*[3] and *Dyen*[4] shout from all the housetops and cry at all the crossroads? Who can fail to realise that this means legitimising *in*equality of nations in respect to language?

Furthermore, whoever wants to establish real national equality cannot confine himself to the negative measure of abolishing disabilities—he must proceed from the abolition of disabilities to the adoption of a positive programme which will guarantee the elimination of national oppression.

It is therefore necessary to proclaim:

1) political autonomy (not federation!) for regions representing integral economic territories possessing a specific way of life and populations of a specific national composition, with the right to conduct "affairs" and "tuition" in their own languages;

2) the right of self-determination for such nations

as cannot, for one reason or another, remain within the framework of the integral state.

This is the way towards the real abolition of national oppression and towards guaranteeing the nationalities the maximum liberty possible under capitalism.

Pravda, No. 17,
March 25, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

EITHER – OR

In the interview he gave on March 23, Mr. Milyukov, Minister of Foreign Affairs, outlined his "programme" on the aims of the present war. Our readers will know from yesterday's *Pravda*[5] that these aims are imperialistic: seizure of Constantinople, seizure of Armenia, partition of Austria and Turkey, seizure of Northern Persia.

It appears that the Russian soldiers are shedding their blood on the battlefields not in "defence of the fatherland," and not "for freedom," as the venal bourgeois press assures us, but for the seizure of foreign territories in the interests of a handful of imperialists.

That, at least, is what Mr. Milyukov says.

In whose name does Mr. Milyukov say all this so frankly and so publicly?

Not, of course, in the name of the Russian people. Because the Russian people—the Russian workers, peasants and soldiers—are *opposed* to the seizure of foreign territories, *opposed* to the violation of nations. This is eloquently attested by the "appeal" of the Petrograd

Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the spokesman of the will of the Russian people.

Whose opinion, then, is Mr. Milyukov expressing?

Can it be the opinion of the Provisional Government as a whole?

But here is what yesterday's *Vecherneye Vremya*[6] had to say about it:

"In connection with the interview given by Foreign Minister Milyukov published in the Petrograd papers on March 23, Minister of Justice Kerensky had authorised the Press Information Bureau of the Ministry of Justice to state that *the exposition it contained of the aims of Russian foreign policy in the present war is the personal opinion of Milyukov and by no means represent the views of the Provisional Government.*"

Thus, if Kerensky is to be believed, Mr. Milyukov does not express the opinion of the Provisional Government on the cardinal question of the war aims.

In brief, when Foreign Minister Milyukov told the world that the aims of the present war were annexationist, he went not only *against* the will of the Russian people, but also *against* the Provisional Government, of which he is a member.

Already in tsarist days Mr. Milyukov advocated the responsibility of Ministers to the people. We agree with him that Ministers should be accountable and responsible to the people. We ask: does Mr. Milyukov still recognise the principle of the responsibility of Ministers? And if he does, why does he not resign?

Or perhaps Kerensky's statement was not—accurate?

Either one thing or the other:

Either Kerensky's statement was untrue, in which case the revolutionary people must call the Provisional Government to order and compel it to recognise its will.

Or Kerensky is right, in which case Mr. Milyukov has no place in the Provisional Government—he *must* resign.

There can be no middle way.

Pravda, No. 18,
March 26, 1917

Editorial

AGAINST FEDERALISM

Delo Naroda,[7] No. 5, carried an article entitled "Russia—a Union of Regions." It recommends nothing more nor less than the conversion of Russia into a "union of regions," a "federal state." Listen to this:

"Be it declared that the federal state of Russia assumes the attributes of sovereignty vested in the various regions (Little Russia, Georgia, Siberia, Turkestan, etc.). . . . But let it grant the various regions internal sovereignty. And let the forthcoming Constituent Assembly establish a Russian Union of Regions."

The author of the article (Jos. Okulich) explains this in the following manner:

"Let there be instituted a single Russian army, a single currency, a single foreign policy, a single supreme court. But let the various regions of the single state be free to build their new life independently. If already in 1776 the Americans . . . created a 'United States' by means of a treaty of union, why should we in 1917 be incapable of creating a firm union of regions?"

So says *Delo Naroda*.

One has to admit that the article is in many respects interesting and, at any rate, original. Intriguing,

too, is the solemnity of its tone, its "manifesto" style, so to speak ("be it declared," "let there be instituted"!).

For all that, it must be observed that in general it is a peculiar piece of muddle-headedness. And the muddle is due at bottom to its more than frivolous treatment of the constitutional history of the United States of America (as well as of Switzerland and Canada).

What does this history tell us?

In 1776, the United States was not a federation, but a confederation of what until then were independent colonies, or states. That is, there were independent colonies, but later, in order to protect their common interests against their enemies, chiefly external, they concluded an alliance (*confederation*), without, however, ceasing to be fully independent state units. In the 1860's a crucial change took place in the political life of the country: the Northern states demanded a firmer and closer political connection between the states, in opposition to the Southern states, which protested against "centralism" and stood up for the old system. The "Civil War" broke out and resulted in the Northern states gaining the upper hand. A *federation* was established in America, that is, a union of sovereign states which *shared* power with the federal (central) government. But this system did not last long. Federation proved to be as much a transitional measure as confederation. The struggle between the states and the central government continued unceasingly, dual government became intolerable, and in the course of its further evolution the United States was transformed from a federation into

a *unitary* (integral) state, with uniform constitutional provisions and the limited autonomy (not governmental, but political-administrative) permitted to the states by these provisions. The name "federation" as applied to the United States became an empty word, a relic of the past which had long since ceased to correspond to the actual state of affairs.

The same must be said of Switzerland and Canada, to whom the author of the article likewise refers. We find the same independent states (cantons) at the beginning, the same struggle for stronger union (the war against the Sonderbund[8] in Switzerland, the struggle between the British and French in Canada), and the same subsequent conversion of the federation into a unitary state.

What do these facts indicate?

Only that in America, as well as in Canada and Switzerland, the development was *from* independent regions, *through* their federation, to a unitary state; that the trend of development is not in favour of federation, but *against* it. Federation is a transitional form.

This is not fortuitous, because the development of capitalism in its higher forms, with the concomitant expansion of the economic territory, and its trend towards centralisation, demands not a federal, but a unitary form of state.

We cannot ignore this trend, unless, of course, we try to turn back the wheel of history.

But it follows from this that in Russia it would be unwise to work for a federation, which is doomed by the very realities of life to disappear.

Delo Naroda proposes to repeat in Russia the experience of the United States of 1776. But is there even a remote analogy between the United States of 1776 and the Russia of today?

The United States was at that time a congeries of independent colonies, unconnected with one another and desirous of linking themselves together at least in the form of a confederation. And that desire was quite natural. Is the situation in any way similar in present-day Russia? Of course, not! It is clear to everyone that the regions (border districts) of Russia are *linked* with Central Russia by economic and political ties, and that the more democratic Russia becomes, the stronger these ties will be.

Further, in order to establish a confederation or federation in America, it was necessary to *unite* colonies which were unconnected with one another. And that was in the interest of the economic development of the United States. But in order to convert Russia into a federation, it would be necessary to *break* the already existing economic and political ties connecting the regions with one another, which would be absolutely unwise and reactionary.

Lastly, America (like Canada and Switzerland) is divided into states (cantons) not on national, but on geographical lines. The states evolved from colonial communities, irrespective of their national composition. There are several dozen states in the United States, but only seven or eight national groups. There are 25 cantons (regions) in Switzerland, but only three national groups. Not so in Russia. What in Russia are called regions which need, say, autonomy (the Ukraine, Trans-

caucasia, Siberia, Turkestan, etc.), are not simply geographical regions, as the Urals or the Volga area are; they are definite parts of Russia, each with its own definite way of life and a population of definite (non-Russian) national composition. Precisely for this reason autonomy (or federation) of the states in America or Switzerland, far from being a solution for the national problem (this, in fact, is not its aim!), does not even raise the question. But, in Russia, autonomy (or federation) of the regions is proposed precisely in order to raise and solve the national problem, because Russia is divided into regions on national lines.

Is it not clear then that the analogy between the United States of 1776 and the Russia of today is artificial and foolish?

Is it not clear that in Russia federalism would not, and cannot, solve the national problem, that it would only confuse and complicate it by quixotic attempts to turn back the wheel of history?

No, the proposal to repeat in Russia the experience of America of 1776 will positively not do. The transitional half-measure, federation, does not and cannot satisfy the interests of democracy.

The solution of the national problem must be as practicable as it is radical and final, viz.:

1) The right of secession for the nations inhabiting certain regions of Russia who cannot remain, or who do not desire to remain, within the integral framework;

2) Political autonomy within the framework of the single (integral) state, with uniform constitutional provisions, for the regions which have a specific national

composition and which remain within the integral framework.

It is in this way, and in this way alone, that the problem of the regions should be solved in Russia.*

Pravda, No. 19,
March 28, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

*AUTHOR'S NOTE

This article reflects the attitude of disapproval towards a federal form of state which prevailed in our Party at that time. The objection to constitutional federalism was most distinctly expressed in Lenin's letter to Shaumyan of November 1913. "We," Lenin said in that letter, "stand for democratic centralism, unreservedly. We are opposed to federation. . . . We are opposed to federation in principle—it weakens economic ties, and is unsuitable for what is one state. You want to secede? Well, go to the devil if you can bring yourself to sever economic ties, or, rather, if the burden and friction of 'cohabitation' are such that they poison and corrode economic ties. You don't want to secede? Good, but then don't decide for me, and don't think you have the 'right' to federation" (see Vol. XVII, p. 90**).

It is noteworthy that in the resolution on the national question adopted by the April Conference of the

** References in Roman numerals to Lenin's works here and elsewhere are to the 3rd edition of the *Works*.—*Tr.*

Party in 1917,[9] the question of a federal structure was not even mentioned. The resolution spoke of the right of nations to secession, of autonomy for national regions within the framework of the integral (unitary) state, and, lastly, of the enactment of a fundamental law prohibiting all national privileges whatsoever, but not a word was said about the permissibility of a federal structure of the state.

In Lenin's book, *The State and Revolution* (August 1917), the Party, in the person of Lenin, made the first serious step towards recognition of the permissibility of federation, as a transitional form "to a centralised republic," this recognition, however, being accompanied by a number of substantial reservations.

"Approaching the matter from the point of view of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution," Lenin says in this book, "Engels, like Marx, upheld democratic centralism, the republic—one and indivisible. He regarded the federal republic either as an exception and a hindrance to development, or as a transitional form from a monarchy to a centralised republic, as a 'step forward' under certain special conditions. And, as one of these special conditions, he mentions the national question. . . . Even in regard to England, where geographical conditions, a common language and the history of many centuries would seem to have 'put an end' to the national question in the separate small divisions of England—even in regard to that country, Engels reckoned with the patent fact that the national question was not yet a thing of the past, and recognised in consequence that the establishment of a federal republic would be a 'step forward.' Of course, there is not the slightest hint here of Engels abandoning the criticism of the shortcomings of a federal republic or that he abandoned the most determined propaganda and struggle for a unified and centralised democratic republic" (see Vol. XXI, p. 419).

Only after the October Revolution did the Party firmly and definitely adopt the position of state feder-

ation, advancing it as its own plan for the constitution of the Soviet Republics in the transitional period. This position was expressed for the first time in January 1918, in the "Declaration of Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People," written by Lenin and approved by the Central Committee of the Party. This declaration said: "The Russian Soviet Republic is established on the principle of a free union of free nations, as a federation of Soviet national republics" (see Vol. XXII, p. 174).

Officially, this position was affirmed by the Party at its Eighth Congress (1919).[10] It was at this congress, as we know, that the programme of the Russian Communist Party was adopted. The programme says: "As one of the transitional forms towards complete unity, the Party recommends a federal union of states organised on the Soviet pattern" (see Programme of the R.C.P.).

Thus the Party traversed the path from denial of federation to recognition of federation as "a transitional form to the complete unity of the working people of the various nations" (see "Theses on the National Question"[11] adopted by the Second Congress of the Comintern).

This evolution in our Party's views on the question of a federal state is to be attributed to three causes.

First, the fact that at the time of the October Revolution a number of the nationalities of Russia were actually in a state of complete secession and complete isolation from one another, and, in view of this, federation represented a step forward from the division of the working masses of these nationalities to their closer union, their association.

Secondly, the fact that the very forms of federation which suggested themselves in the course of Soviet development proved by no means so contradictory to the aim of closer economic unity between the working masses of the nationalities of Russia as might have appeared formerly, and even did not contradict this aim at all, as was subsequently demonstrated in practice.

Thirdly, the fact that the national movement proved to be far more weighty a factor, and the process of the uniting of nations far more complicated a matter than might have appeared formerly, in the period prior to the war, or in the period prior to the October Revolution.

J. ST.

December 1924

TWO RESOLUTIONS

Two resolutions. One—that of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The other—that of the workers (400) of the machine shops of the Russo-Baltic Railway Car Works.

The former is for supporting the so-called "Liberty Loan."

The latter is against.

The former uncritically accepts the "Liberty Loan" at its face value, as a loan *in support of liberty*.

The latter characterises the "Liberty Loan" as a loan *against liberty*, because it is "being floated with the aim of continuing the fratricidal slaughter, which is advantageous only to the imperialist bourgeoisie."

The former is prompted by the misgivings of distraught minds—what about the supply of the army, will not the supply of the army be injured by refusal to support the loan?

The latter has no such misgivings, because it sees a solution: it "recognises that to supply the needs of the army funds are required, and points out to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies that these funds should be taken from the pockets of the bourgeoisie, who started and are continuing this war, and who are coining millions out of the slaughter."

The authors of the first resolution should be content, for have they not "done their duty"?

The authors of the second resolution protest, considering that by such an attitude towards the cause of the proletariat the former are "*betraying the International.*"

That hits the nail on the head!

For and *against* a "Liberty Loan" that is directed *against* liberty.

Workers, who are right? Decide for yourselves, comrades.

Pravda, No. 29,
April 11, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

THE LAND TO THE PEASANTS

The peasants of the Ryazan Gubernia have sent a statement to Minister Shingaryov to the effect that they will plough the land left uncultivated by the landlords even if the landlords do not give their consent. The peasants declare that it will be disastrous if the landlords refrain from planting, that immediate ploughing of untilled land is the only means of ensuring bread both for the population in the rear and for the army at the front.

In reply to this, Minister Shingaryov (see his telegram[12]) emphatically prohibits unauthorised ploughing, calling it "usurpation," and orders the peasants to wait until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly; it, forsooth, will settle everything.

As, however, it is not known when the Constituent Assembly will be convened, since its convocation is being postponed by the Provisional Government, of which Mr. Shingaryov is a member, it follows that, *in fact*, the land is to remain unploughed, the landlords are to remain *in possession* of the land, the peasants *without* land, and Russia—the workers, the peasants and the soldiers—without sufficient bread.

And all this in order not to offend the landlords, even though Russia fall into the clutches of famine.

Such is the reply of the Provisional Government, of which Minister Shingaryov is a member.

This reply does not surprise us. A government of manufacturers and landlords cannot behave otherwise towards the peasants—what do they care about the peasants so long as all is well with the landlords?

We, therefore, call upon the peasants, upon the peasant poor of all Russia, to take their cause into their own hands and push it forward.

We call upon them to organise revolutionary peasant committees (volost, uyezd, etc.), take over the landed estates through these committees, and cultivate the land in an organised manner without authorisation.

We call upon them to do this without delay, not waiting for the Constituent Assembly and paying no attention to reactionary ministerial prohibitions which put spokes in the wheel of the revolution.

We are told that immediate seizure of the landed estates would disrupt the "unity" of the revolution by splitting off the "progressive strata" of society from it.

But it would be naive to think that it is possible to advance the revolution without quarrelling with the manufacturers and landlords.

Did not the workers "split off" the manufacturers and their ilk from the revolution when they introduced the eight-hour day? Who would venture to assert that the revolution has suffered from having alleviated the condition of the workers, from having shortened the working day?

Unauthorised cultivation of the landed estates and their seizure by the peasants will undoubtedly "split off" the landlords and their ilk from the revolution. But who

would venture to assert that by rallying the millions of poor peasants around the revolution we shall be weakening the forces of the revolution?

People who want to influence the course of the revolution must realise once and for all:

1) That the main forces of our revolution are the workers and the poor peasants who, owing to the war, are now wearing soldier's uniform;

2) That as the revolution grows deeper and wider, the so-called "progressive elements," who are progressive in word but reactionary in deed, will "split off" from it inevitably.

It would be reactionary utopianism to retard this beneficent process of purging the revolution of unnecessary "elements."

The policy of waiting and procrastinating until the Constituent Assembly is convened,the policy recommended by the Narodniks, Trudoviks, and Mensheviks of "temporarily" renouncing confiscation, the policy of zigzagging between the classes (so as not to offend anybody!) and of shamefully marking time, is not the policy of the revolutionary proletariat.

The victorious onmarch of the Russian revolution will sweep it away like so much superfluous lumber that is suitable and advantageous only to the enemies of the revolution.

Pravda, No 32,
April 14, 1917
Editorial

Signed: *K. Stalin*

MAY DAY

It is nearly three years since the bourgeois vampires of the belligerent countries plunged the world into a bloody shambles.

For nearly three years now the workers of all countries, who were yesterday kin brothers and are now clad in soldier's uniform, have stood confronting one another as enemies, and are crippling and murdering one another to the joy of the enemies of the proletariat.

Wholesale slaughter of the man-power of the nations, wholesale ruin and want, destruction of once flourishing towns and villages, wholesale starvation and lapse into savagery, all in order that a handful of crowned and uncrowned robbers may pillage foreign lands and rake in untold millions—this is where the war is tending.

The world has begun to stifle in the grip of war. . . .

The peoples of Europe can bear it no longer, and are already rising up against the bellicose bourgeoisie.

The Russian revolution is the first to be forcing a breach in the wall that divides the workers from one another. The Russian workers, at this time of universal "patriotic" frenzy, are the first to proclaim the forgotten slogan: "Workers of all countries, unite!"

Amidst the thunder of the Russian revolution, the workers of the West too are rising from their slumber. The strikes and demonstrations in Germany, the demonstrations in Austria and Bulgaria, the strikes and meetings in neutral countries, the growing unrest in Britain and France, the mass fraternisation on the battle fronts—these are the first harbingers of the socialist revolution that is brewing.

And this holiday we are celebrating today, this May Day, is it not a sign that in the welter of blood new ties of fraternity among the peoples are being forged?

The soil is burning underneath the feet of the capitalist robbers, for the Red Flag of the International is again waving over Europe.

Let, then, this First of May, when hundreds of thousands of Petrograd workers extend the hand of fraternity to the workers of the world, be an earnest of the birth of a new revolutionary International!

Let the slogan which resounds today in the squares of Petrograd—"Workers of all countries, unite!"—reverberate through the world and unite the workers of all countries in the fight for socialism!

Over the heads of the capitalist robbers, over the heads of their predatory governments, we extend a hand to the workers of all countries, and cry:

Hail the First of May!
Hail the Brotherhood of Nations!
Hail the Socialist Revolution!

Pravda, No. 35,
April 18 (May 1), 1917

Unsigned

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Speech Delivered at a Meeting in Vasilyevsky Ostrov
April 18 (May 1), 1917

In the course of the revolution two governmental authorities have arisen in the country: the Provisional Government, elected by the Duma of June the Third, and the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, elected by the workers and soldiers.

The relations between these two authorities are becoming increasingly strained; the former co-operation between them is coming to an end; and it would be criminal on our part to gloss over this fact.

The bourgeoisie were the first to raise the question of the dual power; they were the first to pose the alternative: *either* the Provisional Government, *or* the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The question has been put bluntly, and it would be unworthy of us to evade it. The workers and soldiers must say clearly and distinctly which they consider to be their government—the Provisional Government, or the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

We are told that there must be confidence in the Provisional Government, that this confidence is essential. But what confidence can there be in a government

which itself has no confidence in the people on the cardinal and basic issue? We are in the midst of a war. It is being waged on the basis of treaties concluded by the tsar with Britain and France behind the back of the people and now sanctified by the Provisional Government without the consent of the people. The people are entitled to know the contents of these treaties; the workers and soldiers are entitled to know what they are shedding their blood for. To the demand of the workers and soldiers that the treaties be made public, what did the Provisional Government reply?

It declared that the treaties remained in force.

And it did not publish the treaties, and doesn't intend to publish them!

Is it not obvious that the Provisional Government is concealing the real aims of the war from the people and that, by concealing them, it is stubbornly refusing to put its confidence in the people? What confidence can the workers and peasants have in a Provisional Government which itself has no confidence in them on the cardinal and basic issue?

We are told that the Provisional Government must be supported, that such support is essential. But judge for yourselves: can we, in a period of revolution, support a government which has been hindering the revolution from its very inception? So far, the situation has been one in which the revolutionary initiative and democratic measures emanated from the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and from it alone. The Provisional Government held back and resisted and only afterwards agreed with the Soviet, and then only partially and

verbally, while in practice creating obstacles. Such has been the situation so far. But how is it possible, at the height of revolution, to support a government which gets in the way of the revolution and pulls it back? Would it not be better to demand that the Provisional Government should not hinder the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in the work of further democratising the country?

The forces of counter-revolution are mobilising in the land. They are carrying on agitation in the army. They are carrying on agitation among the peasants and the small townsfolk. The counter-revolutionary agitation is spearheaded first and foremost against the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. It uses the name of the Provisional Government as a screen. And the Provisional Government plainly connives at the attacks on the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Why, then, should we support the Provisional Government? Not for its connivance at counter-revolutionary agitation, surely?

An agrarian movement has begun in Russia. The peasants are seeking on their own authority to plough the land left untilled by the landlords. If that is not done, the country may find itself on the verge of famine. In compliance with the wishes of the peasants, the All-Russian Conference of Soviets[13] resolved to "support" the peasant movement for the confiscation of the landed estates. But what does the Provisional Government do? It characterises the peasant movement as "usurpation," forbids the peasants to plough up the landed estates, and issues instructions "accordingly" to its commissars (see *Rech*, April 17). Why, then, should we support the

Provisional Government? Not for its having declared war on the peasantry, surely?

We are told that lack of confidence in the Provisional Government will undermine the unity of the revolution, repel the capitalists and landlords from it. But who will venture to assert that the capitalists and landlords really are supporting, or can support, the revolution of the masses?

Did not the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, when it introduced the eight-hour working day, repel the capitalists, and at the same time rally the broad mass of the workers around the revolution? Who would venture to assert that the dubious friendship of a handful of manufacturers is more valuable to the revolution than the real friendship of millions of workers which has been cemented with blood?

Or again, did not the All-Russian Conference of Soviets, when it decided to support the peasants, repel the landlords and at the same time link the peasant masses to the revolution? Who would venture to assert that the dubious friendship of a handful of landlords is more valuable to the revolution than the real friendship of the many millions of poor peasants now clad in soldier's uniform?

The revolution cannot satisfy everyone and everybody. One of its sides always satisfies the toiling masses, while the other strikes at the overt and covert enemies of the masses.

It is therefore necessary to choose: either with the workers and poor peasants *for* the revolution, or with the capitalists and landlords *against* the revolution.

And so, who shall we support?

Who shall we regard as our government: the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or the Provisional Government?

Clearly, the workers and soldiers can support only the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which they themselves elected.

Soldatskaya Pravda, No. 6,
April 25, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

THE CONFERENCE IN THE MARIINSKY PALACE

A report of the conference between the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Provisional Government has already appeared in the bourgeois press. This report, which in general is rather less than accurate, in places flatly distorts the facts and is misleading. This apart from the peculiar manner of handling the facts which is characteristic of the bourgeois press. It is therefore necessary to reproduce the real picture of what happened at the conference.

The purpose of the conference was to clarify the relations between the Provisional Government and the Executive Committee in connection with Minister Milyukov's Note,[14] which had sharpened the conflict.

The conference was opened by Premier Lvov. His introductory speech boiled down to the following points. Until very recently the country had had confidence in the Provisional Government and things had gone satisfactorily. But now this confidence had disappeared, and there was even resistance. This had been felt particularly in the past fortnight, when certain well-known socialist circles started a campaign in the press against the Provisional Government. That could not continue.

They must have the determined support of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Otherwise, they would resign.

Then came "reports" by Ministers (War, Agriculture, Transport, Finance, Foreign Affairs), the most outspoken being Guchkov, Shingaryov and Milyukov. The speeches of the other Ministers only repeated their conclusions.

Minister Guchkov's speech amounted to a justification of the imperialist view of our revolution, namely, that the revolution in Russia must be regarded as a means of "fighting the war to a finish." "It was my conviction," he said in effect, "that a revolution in Russia was needed in order to avoid defeat. I wanted the revolution to create a new factor of victory, and I hoped that it would create it. Our aim is defencism in the broad meaning of the term, defencism not only for the present, but also for the future. But in these past weeks there have been a number of adverse developments. . . . The fatherland is in danger." . . . The chief reason was the "spate of pacifist ideas" preached by certain socialist circles. The Minister transparently hinted that this preaching must be curbed, that discipline must be restored, and that in this the assistance of the Executive Committee was needed. . . .

Minister Shingaryov painted a picture of the food crisis in Russia. . . . The cardinal issue was not the Note and foreign policy, but grain: if the grain situation were not remedied, nothing could be remedied. No small factor in aggravating the food crisis was the spoiling of the roads owing to the spring thaw, and other transient causes. But the chief reason, Shingaryov considered,

was the "deplorable fact" that the peasants were "taking up the land question," were arbitrarily ploughing up landed estates, removing war prisoners from the landlords' farms, and generally indulging in agrarian "illusions." This peasant movement—in Shingaryov's opinion a harmful movement—was being "fanned" by the agitation of the "Leninists" in favour of the confiscation of the land and their "fanatical partisan blindness." The "pernicious agitation" from that "poisonous nest, the Kshesinska mansion,"[15] must be stopped. . . . One or the other: *either* confidence in the existing Provisional Government, in which case the agrarian "excesses" must stop; *or* another government.

Milyukov. "The Note is not my personal opinion, but the opinion of the entire Provisional Government. The question of foreign policy amounts to the question of whether we are prepared to fulfil our pledges to our allies. We are bound to our allies. . . . Generally, we are assessed as a force solely by whether we are fitted or unfitted for specified purposes. We have only to show ourselves weak, and the attitude towards us will change for the worse. . . . Renunciation of annexations would therefore be fraught with danger. . . . We need your confidence; let us have it, and then there will be enthusiasm in the army, we shall then have an offensive in the interests of unity of the front, we shall then press hard on the Germans and deflect them from the French and British. This is demanded by our commitments to our allies." "You see, then," Milyukov concluded, "that, the situation being what it is, and we not being desirous of losing the confidence of our allies, the Note could not be other than it was."

Thus the lengthy speeches of the Ministers boiled down to a few terse theses: the country was passing through a severe crisis; the cause of the crisis was the revolutionary movement; the way out of the crisis was to curb the revolution and carry on with the war.

It followed that to save the country it was necessary: 1) to curb the soldiers (Guchkov), 2) to curb the peasants (Shingaryov), 3) to curb the revolutionary workers (all the Ministers), who are unmasking the Provisional Government. Support us in this difficult job, help us to wage an offensive war (Milyukov), and all will be well. Otherwise, we resign.

That is what the Ministers said.

It is highly noteworthy that these arch-imperialist and counter-revolutionary speeches of the Ministers met with no rebuff from the representative of the Executive Committee majority, Tsereteli. Scared by the Ministers' bluntness, and dumbfounded by the prospect of their resignation, Tsereteli, in his speech, implored them to make a still possible concession by issuing an "explanation"[16] of the Note in a desirable spirit, at least for "home consumption." "The democracy," he said, "would support the Provisional Government with the utmost energy," if it consented to make this concession, which, essentially speaking, would be a purely verbal one.

A desire to gloss over the conflict between the Provisional Government and the Executive Committee, a readiness to make concessions so long as agreement was maintained—such was the keynote of Tsereteli's speeches.

Quite the opposite was the tenor of Kamenev's speech. If the country was on the verge of disaster, if

it was in the throes of economic, food and other crises, the way out lay not in continuing the war, which would only aggravate the crisis and might devour the fruits of the revolution, but in its speediest termination. To all appearances the existing Provisional Government was not capable of assuming the task of ending the war, because it was out for a "war to a finish." The solution therefore lay in the transfer of power to another class, a class capable of leading the country out of the impasse. . . .

When Kamenev concluded, there were cries from the Ministerial seats: "Well, then, take power yourselves!"

Pravda, No. 40,
April 25, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

THE SEVENTH (APRIL) CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)

April 24-29, 1917

1. SPEECH IN SUPPORT OF COMRADE LENIN'S RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION

April 24

Comrades, that which Bubnov proposes is provided for in Comrade Lenin's resolution. Comrade Lenin does not reject mass action, demonstrations. But this is not the point at present. The disagreement centres around the question of control. Control presumes controller and controlled, and some sort of agreement between controller and controlled. We had control and we had an agreement. What were the results of control? Nil. After Milyukov's pronouncement (of April 19) its shadowy character has become particularly evident.

Guchkov says, "I regard the revolution as a means of fighting better: *let us make a small revolution for the sake of a big victory.*" But now the army is permeated with pacifist ideas and it is impossible to fight. The government tells us, "Stop the propaganda against the war, otherwise we resign."

On the agrarian question the government is likewise unable to meet the interests of the peasants, the seizure by the latter of the landed estates. We are told, "Help us to curb the peasants, otherwise we resign."

Milyukov says, "Unity of the front must be preserved, we must attack the enemy. Inspire the soldiers with enthusiasm, otherwise we resign."

And after this we are proposed control. It is ridiculous! At first the Soviet outlined the programme, now the Provisional Government outlines it. The alliance concluded between the Soviet and the government on the day after the crisis (Milyukov's pronouncement) signifies that the Soviet is following the government. The government attacks the Soviet. The Soviet retreats. To suggest after this that the Soviet controls the government is just idle talk. That is why I propose that Bubnov's amendment on control be not accepted.

2. REPORT ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

April 29

The national question should be the subject of an extensive report, but since time is short I must make my report brief.

Before discussing the draft resolution certain premises must be established.

What is national oppression? National oppression is the system of exploitation and robbery of oppressed peoples, the measures of forcible restriction of the rights of oppressed nationalities, resorted to by imperialist circles. These, taken together, represent the policy generally known as a policy of national oppression.

The first question is, on what classes does any particular government rely in carrying out its policy of national oppression? Before an answer to this question can be given, it must first be understood why different forms

of national oppression exist in different states, why national oppression is severer and cruder in one state than in another. For instance, in Britain and Austria-Hungary national oppression has never taken the form of pogroms, but has existed in the form of restrictions on the national rights of the oppressed nationalities. In Russia, on the other hand, it not unfrequently assumes the form of pogroms and massacres. In certain states, moreover, there are no specific measures against national minorities at all. For instance, there is no national oppression in Switzerland, where French, Italians and Germans all live freely.

How are we to explain the difference in attitude towards nationalities in different states?

By the difference in the degree of democracy prevailing in these states. When in former years the old landed aristocracy controlled the state power in Russia, national oppression could assume, and actually did assume, the monstrous form of massacres and pogroms. In Britain, where there is a certain degree of democracy and political freedom, national oppression is of a less brutal character. Switzerland approximates to a democratic society, and in that country the nations have more or less complete freedom. In short, the more democratic a country, the less the national oppression, and vice versa. And since by democracy we mean that definite classes are in control of the state power, it may be said from this point of view that the closer the old landed aristocracy is to power, as was the case in old tsarist Russia, the more severe is the oppression and the more monstrous are its forms.

However, national oppression is maintained not only by the landed aristocracy. There is, in addition, another

force—the imperialist groups, who introduce in their own country the methods of enslaving nationalities learned in the colonies and thus become the natural allies of the landed aristocracy. They are followed by the petty bourgeoisie, a section of the intelligentsia and a section of the upper stratum of the workers, who also share the spoils of robbery. Thus, there is a whole gamut of social forces, headed by the landed and financial aristocracy, which support national oppression. In order to create a real democratic system, it is first of all necessary to clear the ground and remove these forces from the political stage. (*Reads the text of the resolution.*)

The first question is, how is the political life of the oppressed nations to be arranged? In answer to this question it must be said that the oppressed peoples forming part of Russia must be allowed the right to decide for themselves whether they wish to remain part of the Russian state or to secede and form independent states. We are at present witnessing a definite conflict between the Finnish people and the Provisional Government. The representatives of the Finnish people, the representatives of Social-Democracy, are demanding that the Provisional Government should restore to the people the rights they enjoyed before they were annexed to Russia. The Provisional Government refuses, because it will not recognise the sovereignty of the Finnish people. On whose side must we range ourselves? Obviously, on the side of the Finnish people, for it is inconceivable for us to accept the forcible retention of any people whatsoever within the bounds of a unitary state. When we put forward the principle that peoples have the right to self-determination we thereby raise the struggle against na-

tional oppression to the level of a struggle against imperialism, our common enemy. If we fail to do this, we may find ourselves in the position of bringing grist to the mill of the imperialists. If we, Social-Democrats, were to deny the Finnish people the right to declare their will on the subject of secession and the right to give effect to their will, we would be putting ourselves in the position of continuing the policy of tsarism.

It would be impermissible to confuse the question of the *right* of nations freely to secede with the question of whether a nation must *necessarily* secede at any given moment. This latter question must be settled quite separately by the party of the proletariat in each particular case, according to the circumstances. When we recognise the right of oppressed nationalities to secede, the *right* to decide their political destiny, we do not thereby settle the question whether particular nations *should* secede from the Russian state at the given moment. I may recognise the right of a nation to secede, but that does not mean that I oblige it to do so. A people has the right to secede, but it may or may not exercise that right, according to the circumstances. Thus we are at liberty to agitate for or against secession in accordance with the interests of the proletariat, of the proletarian revolution. Hence, the question of secession must be determined in each particular case independently, in accordance with the existing situation, and, for this reason, recognising the right of secession must not be confused with the expediency of secession in any given circumstances. For instance, I personally would be opposed to the secession of Transcaucasia, bearing in mind the common

development in Transcaucasia and Russia, certain conditions of the struggle of the proletariat, and so forth. But if, nevertheless, the peoples of Transcaucasia were to demand secession, they would, of course, secede without encountering opposition from us. (*Reads further the text of the resolution.*)

Further, what is to be done with the peoples which may desire to remain within the Russian state? Whatever mistrust of Russia existed among the peoples was fostered chiefly by the tsarist policy. But now that tsarism no longer exists, and its policy of oppression no longer exists, this mistrust is bound to diminish and attraction towards Russia to increase. I believe that now, after the overthrow of tsarism, nine-tenths of the nationalities will not desire to secede. The Party therefore proposes to institute regional autonomy for regions which do not desire to secede and which are distinguished by peculiarities of manner of life and language, as, for instance, Transcaucasia, Turkestan and the Ukraine. The geographical boundaries of these autonomous regions must be determined by the populations themselves with due regard for economic conditions, manner of life, etc.

In contradistinction to regional autonomy there exists another plan, one which has long been recommended by the Bund,[17] and particularly by Springer and Bauer, who advocate the principle of cultural-national autonomy. I consider that plan unacceptable for Social-Democrats. Its essence is that Russia should be transformed into a union of nations, and nations into unions of persons, drawn into a common society no matter what part of the state they may be living in. All Russians, all Armenians, and so on, are to be organised into separate

national unions, irrespective of territory, and only then are they to enter the union of nations of all Russia. That plan is extremely inconvenient and inexpedient. The fact is that the development of capitalism has dispersed whole groups of people, severed them from their nations and scattered them through various parts of Russia. In view of the dispersion of nations resulting from economic conditions, to draw together the various individuals of a given nation would be to organise and build a nation artificially. And to draw people together into nations artificially would be to adopt the standpoint of nationalism. That plan, advanced by the Bund, cannot be endorsed by Social-Democrats. It was rejected at the 1912 conference of our Party, and generally enjoys no popularity in Social-Democratic circles with the exception of the Bund. That plan is also known as cultural autonomy, because from among the numerous and varied questions which interest a nation it would single out the group of cultural questions and put them in the charge of national unions. The reason for singling out these questions is the assumption that what unites a nation into an integral whole is its culture. It is assumed that within a nation there are, on the one hand, interests which tend to disintegrate the nation, economic, for instance, and on the other, interests which tend to weld it into an integral whole, and that the latter interests are cultural interests.

Lastly, there is the question of the national minorities. Their rights must be specially protected. The Party therefore demands full equality of status in educational, religious and other matters and the abolition of all restrictions on national minorities.

There is § 9, which proclaims the equality of nations. The conditions required for its realisation can arise only when the whole of society has been fully democratised.

We have still to settle the question of how to organise the proletariat of the various nations into a single, common party. One plan is that the workers should be organised on national lines—so many nations, so many parties. That plan was rejected by the Social-Democrats. Experience has shown that the organisation of the proletariat of a given state on national lines tends only to destroy the idea of class solidarity. All the proletarians of all the nations in a given state must be organised in a single, indivisible proletarian collective.

Thus, our views on the national question can be reduced to the following propositions:

a) Recognition of the right of nations to secession;

b) Regional autonomy for nations remaining within the given state;

c) Special legislation guaranteeing freedom of development for national minorities;

d) A single, indivisible proletarian collective, a single party, for the proletarians of all nationalities of the given state.

3. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

April 29

The two resolutions are on the whole similar. Pyatakov has copied all the points of our resolution except one—"recognition of the right of secession." One thing or the other: either we deny the nations the right of se-

cession, in which case it must be stated explicitly; or we do not deny them this right. There is at present a movement in Finland for securing national freedom, and there is also the fight waged against it by the Provisional Government. The question arises, who are we to support? Either we are for the policy of the Provisional Government, the forcible retention of Finland and the reduction of her rights to a minimum—in which case we are annexationists, for we are bringing grist to the mill of the Provisional Government; or we are for independence for Finland. We must express ourselves definitely one way or the other; we cannot limit ourselves to a statement of rights.

There is a movement for independence in Ireland. On whose side are we, comrades? We are either for Ireland or for British imperialism. And I ask: Are we on the side of the peoples which are resisting oppression, or on the side of the classes which are oppressing them? We say that inasmuch as the Social-Democrats are steering for a socialist revolution, they must support the revolutionary movement of the peoples, which is directed against imperialism.

Either we consider that we must create a rear for the vanguard of the socialist revolution in the shape of the peoples which are rising against national oppression—and in that case we shall build a bridge between West and East and shall indeed be steering for a world socialist revolution; or we do not do this—and in that case we shall find ourselves isolated and shall be abandoning the tactics of utilising every revolutionary movement among the oppressed nationalities for the purpose of destroying imperialism.

We must support every movement directed against imperialism. Otherwise what will the Finnish workers say of us? Pyatakov and Dzerzhinsky tell us that every national movement is a reactionary movement. That is not true, comrades. Is not the Irish movement against British imperialism a democratic movement which is striking a blow at imperialism? And ought we not to support that movement?

First published in
The Petrograd City and All-Russian Conferences of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) in April 1917,
Moscow and Leningrad, 1925

LAGGING BEHIND THE REVOLUTION

The revolution is advancing, growing deeper and wider, spreading from one sphere to another, and revolutionising the whole social and economic life of the country from top to bottom.

Invading industry, it is raising the demand for control and regulation of production by the workers (Donets Basin).

Spreading to agriculture, it is giving an impetus to the collective cultivation of unused land and the supplying of implements and livestock to the peasantry (Schlüsselburg Uyezd).[18]

Exposing the ulcers of the war and the economic disruption produced by the war, it is bursting into the sphere of distribution and is raising the question, on the one hand, of the supply of food to the towns (food crisis), and, on the other, of the supply of manufactures to the rural districts (goods crisis).

The solution of all these and similar urgent problems calls for a maximum display of initiative on the part of the revolutionary masses, the active intervention of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies in the work of building the new life, and, lastly, the transfer of full power to

the new class which is capable of leading the country on to the broad road of revolution.

The revolutionary masses in the localities are already taking this road. In some places the revolutionary organisations have already taken power into their own hands (Urals, Schlüsselburg), ignoring the so-called Committees of Public Salvation.

Yet the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, which should be leading the revolution, is helplessly marking time, lagging behind and drifting away from the masses; and for the cardinal question of assuming full power it is substituting the trivial question of "candidates" to the Provisional Government. By lagging behind the masses, the Executive Committee is lagging behind the revolution and impeding its progress.

Before us lie two documents of the Executive Committee: "Notes for Workers' Delegates at the Front" who are carrying presents to the soldiers, and an "Appeal to the Soldiers at the Front." And what do they show? Why, this same backwardness of the Executive Committee. For on the most important questions of the day the Executive Committee, in these documents, gives the most revolting, the most anti-revolutionary replies!

The Question of the War

While the Executive Committee was wrangling with the Provisional Government over annexations and indemnities, while the Provisional Government was manufacturing "Notes" and the Executive Committee was gloating in the role of "victor," and in the meantime the war of conquest was continuing as of old, life in the

trenches, the real life of the soldiers, had developed a new means of struggle—mass fraternisation. Unquestionably, in itself, fraternisation is only a spontaneous manifestation of the desire for peace. Nevertheless, if carried out deliberately and in organised fashion, fraternisation may become a mighty instrument of the working class for revolutionising the situation in the warring countries.

And what is the attitude of the Executive Committee towards fraternisation?

Listen:

"Soldier comrades, you will not get peace by fraternisation. . . . Those who tell you that fraternisation is the way to peace are leading you to your doom, and to the doom of Russian liberty. Don't believe them" (see the "Appeal").

Instead of fraternisation, the Executive Committee urges the soldiers "not to reject the offensive operations which the military situation may demand" (see the "Appeal"). It transpires that "defence in the political sense does not preclude strategical offensives, the occupation of new sectors, etc. In the interests of defence . . . it is absolutely necessary to conduct an offensive, to occupy new positions" (see the "Notes").

In short, in order to achieve peace it is necessary to start an offensive and capture "sectors" of enemy territory.

That is how the Executive Committee argues.

But what is the difference between these imperialist arguments of the Executive Committee and General Alexeyev's counter-revolutionary "order of the day," which declares fraternisation at the front to be "trea-

son," and orders the soldiers "to fight the enemy unmercifully"?

Or again: what is the difference between these arguments and Milyukov's counter-revolutionary speech at the conference in the Mariinsky Palace, in which he demanded "offensive operations" and discipline from the soldiers in the interests of "unity of the front"?

The Question of the Land

Everybody knows about the conflict that has arisen between the peasants and the Provisional Government. The peasants demand the immediate ploughing of land left uncultivated by the landlords, considering this step to be the only means of ensuring bread both for the population in the rear and for the army at the front. In reply, the Provisional Government has declared resolute war on the peasants, treating the agrarian movement as "unlawful"; moreover, commissars have been sent to the localities to protect the landlords' interests from "infringement" on the part of "usurping" peasants. The Provisional Government has ordered the peasants to refrain from confiscating land until the Constituent Assembly meets: it, forsooth, will settle everything.

And what is the attitude of the Executive Committee to this question? Whom does it support—the peasants or the Provisional Government?

Listen to this:

"The revolutionary democracy will most emphatically insist upon . . . the alienation without compensation . . . of the landed estates . . . in the *future* Constituent Assembly. At

present, however, bearing in mind that immediate confiscation of the landed estates may cause . . . serious economic disturbances in the country . . . the revolutionary democracy warns the peasants against any unauthorised settlement of the land question, for agrarian disorders will benefit not the peasantry, but the counter-revolution"; in view of this, it is recommended that "the landlords' property should not be seized arbitrarily until the Constituent Assembly decides" (see the "Notes").

That is what the Executive Committee says.

Evidently, the Executive Committee supports not the peasants, but the Provisional Government.

Is it not clear that in taking such a stand the Executive Committee is espousing Shingaryov's counter-revolutionary cry: "Curb the peasants!"?

And, generally speaking, since when have agrarian movements become "agrarian disorders," and since when has the "unauthorised settlement" of questions become inadmissible? What are the Soviets, including the Petrograd Soviet, if not organisations of "unauthorised" origin? Does the Executive Committee think that the time for "unauthorised" organisations and decisions has passed?

The Executive Committee raises the bogey of a "food crisis" in connection with the unauthorised ploughing up of landed estates. But with a view to increasing the food resources of the population the "unauthorised" Schlüsselburg Uyezd Revolutionary Committee has resolved:

"In order to increase the supply of cereals of which there is a really great need, the village communities should plough up uncultivated land belonging to churches, monasteries, former appanages and private owners."

What objection can the Executive Committee have to this "unauthorised" decision?

What can it offer in place of this wise decision except empty talk about "usurpation," "agrarian disorders," "unauthorised settlement," etc., borrowed from the ukases of Mr. Shingaryov?

Is it not clear that the Executive Committee is lagging behind the revolutionary movement in the provinces, and, by lagging behind it, has come into conflict with it? . . .

A new picture is thus unfolding. The revolution is growing in breadth and depth, spreading to new spheres, invading industry, agriculture and the sphere of distribution, and raising the question of taking over full power. The movement is being led by the provinces. Whereas Petrograd led in the early days of the revolution, it is now beginning to lag behind. And one gets the impression that the Petrograd Executive Committee is trying to *halt* at the point already reached.

But it is impossible to halt in a period of revolution: you have to move—either forward or backward. Therefore, whoever tries to halt in time of revolution must inevitably lag behind. And whoever lags behind receives no mercy: the revolution pushes him into the camp of counter-revolution.

Pravda, No. 48,
May 4, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

WHAT DID WE EXPECT FROM THE CONFERENCE?

Our Party is a union of Social-Democrats of all parts of Russia, from Petrograd to the Caucasus, from Riga to Siberia.

This union was formed for the purpose of helping the toilers to wage a successful struggle against the rich, against the factory owners and landlords, for a better lot, for socialism.

But the fight can be successfully waged only if our Party is united and solid, only if it has one soul and one will, only if it strikes in concert everywhere, in all parts of Russia.

But how is the unity and solidarity of the Party to be achieved?

There is only one way of achieving it, and that is for the elected representatives of the class-conscious workers of all Russia to assemble in one place in order jointly to discuss the fundamental problems of our revolution, to work out one common opinion and then, after returning to their homes, to go among the people and to lead them to one common goal by one common road.

Such an assembly is called a conference.

That is why we all so impatiently looked forward to the convocation of the All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Before the revolution our Party led an underground existence; it was a prohibited party; its members were liable to arrest and deportation to penal servitude. That is why it was organised in such a way as to be adapted for underground work; it was a "secret" party.

Now circumstances have changed; the revolution has brought liberty, the underground has disappeared, and our Party had to become an open party, had to reorganise on new lines.

We are confronted with the question of war or peace. The war has carried off millions of lives, and will carry off millions more. The war is ruining millions of families. It has reduced our cities to starvation and exhaustion. It has deprived the rural districts of the most essential goods. The war is profitable only to the rich, who are filling their pockets on government contracts. The war is profitable only to the governments which are plundering other peoples. It is for the purpose of such plunder that the war is being waged. And so the question arises: What is to be done about the war? Shall it be stopped or continued? Shall we crawl further into the noose or break it once and for all?

The conference had to answer this question.

Further, Russia—the rear as well as the front—is faced with starvation. But starvation will be thrice as severe unless all "vacant" land is ploughed immediately. Yet the landlords are letting the land go uncultivated, are refraining from planting it, and the Provisional Government is forbidding the peasants to take over the

landed estates and cultivate them. . . . What is to be done with a Provisional Government which is supporting the landlords in every way it can? What is to be done with the landlords themselves? Shall they be allowed to retain the land, or shall it be made the property of the people?

To all these questions the conference had to give clear and distinct answers.

For only such answers make the Party united and solid.

Only a united party can lead the people to victory.

Has the conference justified our hopes?

Has it given clear and distinct answers? Let the comrades study the decisions of the conference, which we published as a supplement to No. 13 of our paper,[19] and judge for themselves.

Soldatskaya Pravda, No. 16,
May 6, 1917
Editorial

Signed: *K. Stalin*

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN[20]

The elections to the district Dumas are approaching. The lists of candidates have been adopted and published. The election campaign is in full swing.

Candidates are being put up by the most diverse "parties": genuine and fictitious, old and new-baked, significant and insignificant. Alongside the Constitutional-Democratic Party there is a "Party of Honesty, Responsibility and Justice"; alongside the Yedinstvo group and the Bund there is a "party slightly to the Left of the Constitutional Democrats"; alongside the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary defencists there are all sorts of "non-party" and "supra-party" groups. The fantastic medley of flags is indescribable.

The first election meetings already show that the central issue of the campaign is not municipal "reform" in itself, but the general political situation in the country. Municipal reform is merely the background against which the principal political platforms naturally unfold.

That is understandable. Today, when the war has brought the country to the verge of disruption, when the interests of the majority of the population demand revolutionary intervention in the whole economic life of the

country, and when the Provisional Government is obviously incapable of leading the country out of the impasse, all local questions, including municipal, can be understood and decided only in inseparable connection with the general questions of war or peace, of revolution or counter-revolution. Without this connection with general policy, the municipal election campaign would degenerate into empty chatter about tin-plating wash-basins and "installing good lavatories" (see the platform of the defencist Mensheviks).

That is why in this medley of innumerable party flags two basic political lines will inevitably assert themselves in the course of the campaign: the line of developing the revolution further, and the line of counter-revolution.

The sharper the campaign, the more trenchant will party criticism become, the more distinctly will these two lines stand out, the more untenable will be the position of the intermediate groups which are striving to reconcile the irreconcilable, and the clearer will it become to all that the Menshevik and Narodnik defencists who are sitting between the stools of revolution and counter-revolution are actually impeding the revolution and facilitating the cause of counter-revolution.

* * *

The Party of "Popular Freedom"

Since the overthrow of tsarism the parties of the Right have scattered. This is because their existence in their old form would not profit them now. What has

become of them? They have gathered around the party of so-called "Popular Freedom," around the party of Milyukov and Co. Milyukov's party is now the party of the most extreme Right. That is a fact which nobody disputes. And precisely for this reason that party is now the rallying centre of the counter-revolutionary forces.

Milyukov's party is in favour of curbing the peasants, for it is in favour of suppressing the agrarian movement.

Milyukov's party is in favour of curbing the workers, for it is opposed to the workers' "excessive" demands—it labels all their major demands "excessive."

Milyukov's party is in favour of curbing the soldiers, for it is in favour of "iron discipline," that is, of restoring the rule of the officers over the soldiers.

Milyukov's party is in favour of the predatory war which has brought the country to the verge of disruption and ruin.

Milyukov's party is in favour of "resolute measures" against the revolution. It is "resolutely" opposed to popular freedom, even though it calls itself the party of "Popular Freedom."

Can there be any hope that such a party will reform the city's municipal affairs in the interests of the poorer sections of the population?

Can it be entrusted with the fate of the city?

Never! Under no circumstances!

Our watchword is: No confidence in Milyukov's party; not a single vote for the Party of "Popular Freedom"!

* * *

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks)

Our Party is the very antithesis of the Constitutional Democratic Party. The Cadets [Constitutional Democrats] are the party of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois and landlords. Our Party is the party of the revolutionary workers of town and country. They are two irreconcilable parties; the victory of one means the defeat of the other. Our demands are well known. Our path is clear.

We are opposed to the present war because it is a predatory war, a war of conquest.

We are in favour of peace, a general and democratic peace, because such a peace is the surest way of escape from the disruption of the country's economy and food supply.

There are complaints of a shortage of bread in the towns. But there is no bread because the crop area has diminished owing to the shortage of labour, which has been "driven off" to the war. There is no bread because there are no means of transporting even the supplies that are available, since the railways are engaged in serving the war. Stop the war and there will be bread.

There are complaints of a shortage of manufactured goods in the rural areas. But manufactured goods are lacking because a large number of the mills and factories are engaged on war production. Stop the war and there will be manufactured goods.

We are opposed to the present government because, by calling for an offensive, it is prolonging the war and aggravating the economic disruption and famine.

We are opposed to the present government because, by protecting the profits of the capitalists, it is hindering the revolutionary intervention of the workers in the economic life of the country.

We are opposed to the present government because, by preventing the Peasant Committees from disposing of the landed estates, it is hindering the emancipation of the rural districts from the power of the landlords.

We are opposed to the present government because, by starting the "business" with the withdrawal of the revolutionary troops from Petrograd, and proceeding now to withdraw the revolutionary workers (unburdening Petrograd!), it is dooming the revolution to impotence.

We are opposed to the present government because it is generally incapable of leading the country out of the crisis.

We are in favour of transferring all power to the revolutionary workers, soldiers and peasants.

Only such a power can put an end to the long-protracted predatory war. Only such a power can lay hands on the profits of the capitalists and landlords for the purpose of advancing the revolution and saving the country from utter disruption.

Lastly, we are opposed to the restoration of the police force, the old detested police force, which was divorced from the people and subordinated to "bigwigs" appointed from above.

We are in favour of a universal, elected and recallable militia; for only such a militia can serve as a buttress of the people's interests.

Such are our immediate demands.

We assert that unless these demands are met, unless a fight is waged for these demands, not a single serious municipal reform and no democratisation of municipal affairs is conceivable.

Whoever wants to ensure bread for the people, whoever wants to abolish the housing crisis, whoever wants to impose municipal taxes only on the rich, whoever wants to see these reforms carried out not only in word but in deed, must vote for those who are opposed to the war of conquest, opposed to the landlord and capitalist government, opposed to the restoration of the police force, must vote for those who are in favour of a democratic peace, of the transfer of power to the people themselves, of a people's militia, of genuine democratisation of municipal affairs.

Without these conditions "radical municipal reform" is just empty talk.

* * *

The Defencist Bloc

Between the Cadets and our Party there are a number of intermediate groups which vacillate between revolution and counter-revolution. These are the Yedinstvo group, the Bund, the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary defencists, the Trudoviks,[21] the Popular "Socialists."[22] In some districts they are putting up their candidates separately, but in others they have formed a bloc and have put up a joint list. Against whom have they formed this bloc? Ostensibly against the Cadets. But is this actually so?

The first thing that strikes the eye is that this bloc is utterly unprincipled. What can there be in common,

for instance, between the bourgeois radical Trudovik group and the group of Menshevik defencists, who regard themselves as "Marxists" and "Socialists"? Since when have the Trudoviks, who preach war to a victorious finish, become the comrades-in-arms of the Mensheviks and Bundists, who call themselves "Zimmerwaldists" who "reject the war"? And the Yedinstvo group of Plekhanov, that self-same Plekhanov who already in tsarist days had furled the flag of the International and definitely taken his stand under an alien flag, the yellow flag of imperialism—what can there be in common between this inveterate chauvinist and, say, Tsereteli the "Zimmerwaldist," the honorary chairman of the Menshevik defencist conference? Is it so long since that Plekhanov was urging support of the tsarist government in the war against Germany and Tsereteli the "Zimmerwaldist" was "thundering" against the chauvinist Plekhanov for doing so? The war between the Yedinstvo group and *Rabochaya Gazeta*[23] is at its height, but these worthies pretend to be blind to it and are already beginning to "fraternise." . . .

Is it not obvious that elements so heterogeneous could form only a casual and unprincipled bloc—that it was not principle, but fear of defeat that prompted them to form the bloc?

The next thing that strikes the eye is the fact that in two of the districts, Kazan and Spass (see the "Lists of Candidates"), the Yedinstvo group, the Bund and the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary defencists are not putting up any candidates, but the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in these districts, and in these districts only, are putting forward candidates, contrary to

the decision of the Executive Committee. Evidently, our brave bloc-formers, fearing defeat at the polls, prefer to hide behind the back of the district Soviets and have decided to exploit their prestige. It is amusing to note that these honourable gentlemen, who boast of their sense of "responsibility," lack the courage to come out with open visor and timidly prefer to evade "responsibility.". . .

But what, after all, has united all these heterogeneous groups in one bloc?

The fact that all of them with equal uncertainty, but none the less persistently, follow in the footsteps of the Cadets, and that they all with equal positiveness detest our Party.

All of them, like the Cadets, are in favour of the war—not for purposes of conquest (God forbid!), but for a . . . "peace without annexations and indemnities." A war for peace. . . .

All of them, like the Cadets, are in favour of "iron discipline"—not for the purpose of curbing the soldiers (of course not!), but in the interests of . . . the soldiers themselves.

All of them, like the Cadets, are in favour of an offensive — not in the interests of the British and French bankers (God forbid!), but in the interests of . . . "our new-won freedom."

All of them, like the Cadets, are opposed to the "anarchist leaning of the workers to seize the factories" (see *Rabochaya Gazeta*, May 21),—not in the interests of the capitalists (perish the thought!), but in order not to frighten the capitalists away from the revolution, that is, in the interests of . . . the revolution.

In general, they are all in favour of the revolution—but only in so far (in so far!) as it does not injure the capitalists and landlords, does not run counter to their interests.

In short, they are all in favour of the same practical steps as the Cadets, but with reservations and catchwords about "freedom," "revolution," etc.

But as phrasemongering and catchwords are nothing but words, it follows that in fact they are pursuing the same line as the Cadets.

Their talk about freedom and socialism merely masks the fact that they are Cadet at heart.

And precisely for this reason their bloc is spearheaded not against the counter-revolutionary Cadets, but against the revolutionary workers, against the bloc between our Party, the Mezhrayontsi[24] and the revolutionary Mensheviks.

After all that, can it be expected that these near-Cadet gentlemen will be capable of reforming and reorganising our dislocated municipal affairs?

How can they be entrusted with the fate of the poorer sections of the population when they hourly trample upon their interests and support the predatory war and the government of the capitalists and landlords?

If municipal affairs are to be democratised, if the population is to be ensured food and housing, if the poor are to be relieved of municipal taxes and the whole burden of taxation laid upon the rich, the policy of compromise must be abandoned, and hands must be laid on the profits of the capitalists and houseowners. . . . Is it not clear that the moderate gentlemen of the defencist bloc, since they are afraid of rousing the ire

of the bourgeoisie, are incapable of such revolutionary steps? . . .

In the present Petrograd Duma there is the so-called "Socialist Municipal Group," consisting mainly of defencist Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. That group set up a "finance committee" from among its members for the purpose of framing "immediate measures" for the improvement of municipal affairs. And what do we find? These "reformers" arrived at the conclusion that in order to democratise municipal affairs it was necessary: 1) "to *increase* the water rate," 2) "to *increase* tramway fares." "On the question of charging soldiers for tramway fares it was decided to confer with the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" (see *Novaya Zhïzn*,[25] No. 26). Apparently the members of the committee had the idea of demanding fares from soldiers, but were afraid to do so without the soldiers' consent.

Instead of abolishing taxes on the poor, the worthy members of the committee decided to increase them, not sparing even the soldiers!

These are examples of the municipal practices of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik defencists

Is it not clear that the pompous phrases and pretentious "municipal platforms" serve as a mask for the wretched municipal practices of the defencists?

So it was, so it will be. . . .

The more adroitly they mask themselves with talk of "freedom" and "revolution," the more determinedly and ruthlessly must they be fought.

And so, one of the immediate tasks of the present campaign is to tear the socialist mask from the defencist

bloc, to bring its essentially bourgeois-Cadet nature into the light of day.

No support for the defencist bloc! No confidence in the gentry of this bloc!

The workers must realise that those who are not with them are against them; that the defencist bloc is not with them—consequently, it is against them.

* *
*

The "Non-party" Groups

Of all the bourgeois groups which are putting up their own lists of candidates, the non-party groups occupy the most indefinite position. There are quite a few of these non-party groups, in fact, a whole heap of them—nearly thirty in all. And whom do they not embrace! The "United House Committees" and the "Educational Establishment Employees' Group"; the "Non-party Business Group" and the "Non-party Electors' Group"; the "House Superintendents' Group" and the "Apartment Owners' Society"; the "Supra-party Republican Group" and the "Equal Rights for Women League"; the "Engineers' Union Group" and the "Commercial and Industrial Union"; the "Honesty, Responsibility and Justice Group" and the "Democratic Construction Group"; the "Freedom and Order Group," etc., etc.—such is the motley picture of non-party confusion.

Who are they, where do they hail from, and whither are they bound?

They are all bourgeois groups. For the most part they are comprised of merchants, manufacturers, houseowners, members of the "liberal professions," intellectuals.

They have no programmes based on principle. The electors will never know what these groups which are inviting the man in the street to vote for them are out for.

They have no municipal platform. The electors will never know what improvements they demand in the sphere of municipal affairs and, indeed, why they should vote for them at all.

They have no past, because they did not exist in the past.

They have no future, because they will vanish after the elections like the snows of yesteryear.

They sprang up only during the elections, and are living only for the moment, as long as the elections last; their aim is to get into the district Dumas somehow, and what happens after that they don't care a hang.

They are bourgeois groups who have no programmes and who fear the light and the truth, and who are trying to get their candidates into the district Dumas by contraband means.

Dark are their aims, and dark is their path.

What justifies the existence of these groups?

One could understand the existence of non-party groups in the past, under tsarism, when belonging to a party, to a *Left* party, was ruthlessly punished by "law," when many had to come out as non-party in order to avoid arrest and persecution, when not to belong to a party was a shield against the tsarist zealots of the law. But how can the existence of non-party groups be justified now, when a maximum of freedom prevails, when every party can come out openly and freely without fear of prosecution, when a definite party stand and an open struggle of political parties have become a commandment

and a condition for the political education of the masses? What are they afraid of? From whom are they hiding their real face?

Undoubtedly, many of the electors among the masses have not yet grasped the significance of the programmes of the various political parties; the political conservatism and backwardness they have inherited from tsarism are a hindrance to their rapid enlightenment. But is it not obvious that non-party and programmeless electioneering tends only to perpetuate and legitimatise this backwardness and conservatism? Who would venture to deny that an open and honest struggle of political parties is a most effective means of awakening the masses and of quickening their political activity?

Again we ask, what are these non-party groups afraid of? Why do they shun the light? From whom are they hiding, anyhow? What is the secret?

The fact of the matter is that under the conditions now prevailing in Russia, with a rapidly developing revolution and a maximum of freedom, when the masses are growing in political enlightenment daily and even hourly, it is becoming extremely risky for the bourgeoisie to come out openly. To come out with a frankly bourgeois platform under such conditions is to court certain discredit in the eyes of the masses. The only way of "saving the situation" is to don a non-party mask and pretend to be an inoffensive group like the group of "honesty, responsibility and justice." This is very convenient for fishing in troubled waters. There can be no doubt that pro-Cadet and near-Cadet bourgeois who fear to fight with open visor are trying to slip into the district Dumas under cover of non-party lists.

It is characteristic that there is not a single proletarian group among them, that all these non-party groups are recruited from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, and from its ranks only. And they will undoubtedly succeed in drawing quite a number of confiding and simple-minded electors into their net unless they meet with a proper rebuff from the revolutionary elements.

That is the whole secret.

Hence, the *"non-party" danger* is one of the most serious in the present municipal elections.

It is therefore one of the most important tasks of our campaign to tear the non-party mask from the faces of these gentry, to compel them to show their true countenance, so as to enable the masses to appraise them correctly.

Away with the non-party mask! Let us have a clear and definite political line! Such is our watchword.

* * *

Comrades, tomorrow is polling day. March to the polls in serried ranks and vote solidly for the Bolshevik list!

Not a single vote for the Cadets, the enemies of the Russian revolution!

Not a single vote for the defencists, the advocates of compromise with the Cadets!

Not a single vote for the "non-party" candidates, the masked friends of your enemies!

Pravda, Nos. 63, 64 and 66,
May 21, 24 and 26, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

YESTERDAY AND TODAY

(Crisis of the Revolution)

Before resigning from the Provisional Government, Guchkov and Milyukov presented three demands: 1) restoration of *discipline*, 2) proclamation of an *offensive*, 3) *curbing* of the revolutionary internationalists.

The army is disintegrating, order no longer exists in it; restore discipline, curb the propaganda for peace, otherwise we resign—thus Guchkov "reported" to the Executive Committee at the conference in the Mariinsky Palace (April 20).

We are bound to our allies, they demand our assistance in the interests of unity of the front; call upon the army to start an offensive, curb the opponents of the war, otherwise we resign—thus Milyukov "reported" at the same conference.

That was in the days of the "crisis of power."

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries on the Executive Committee pretended they would not yield.

Thereupon Milyukov published a document "explaining" his "Note"; the orators of the Executive Committee proclaimed this a "victory" for "revolutionary democracy," and—"passions subsided."

But the "victory" proved an imaginary one. A few days later a new "crisis" was announced; Guchkov and Milyukov "had" to resign; endless conferences took place

between the Executive Committee and the Ministers and—"the crisis was resolved" by representatives of the Executive Committee entering the Provisional Government.

Credulous onlookers sighed with relief. At last Guchkov and Milyukov were "vanquished"! At last peace would come, peace "without annexations and indemnities"! The fratricidal slaughter was going to end!

But what happened? The tally of the "victories" of the so-called "democracy" had scarcely been counted, the "obsequies" over the retired Ministers had scarcely been read, when the new Ministers, the "socialist" Ministers, began to talk in a tone soothing to the ear of Guchkov and Milyukov!

Verily, "the dead have laid hold on the living"!

Judge for yourselves.

In his very first speech, at the Peasant Congress,[26] the new War Minister, citizen Kerensky, declared that he intended to restore "iron discipline" in the army. What sort of discipline he meant is definitely indicated in the "Declaration of Rights of the Soldier,"[27] signed by Kerensky, which lays down that under "battle conditions" commanders have "the right to employ armed force . . . against subordinates who refuse to obey orders" (see clause 14 of the "Declaration").

That which Guchkov dreamed of but did not dare to execute, Kerensky has "executed" at one stroke, under cover of high-sounding phrases about liberty, equality and justice.

What is it needed for, this discipline?

The first Minister to enlighten us on this point was Minister Tsereteli. "We are striving to end the war," he told post-office employees, "not by means of a separate

peace, but by a joint victory with our Allies over the enemies of liberty" (see *Vechernyaya Birzhovka*,[28] May 8).

If we disregard the word "liberty," which was stuck in simply for effect, if we translate this ministerially-nebulous speech into plain language, it can mean only one thing: in the interests of peace we must, in alliance with Britain and France, smash Germany, and for this, in turn, we must have an offensive.

That is what "iron discipline" is needed for—in order to prepare an offensive in the interests of a united front for a joint victory over Germany.

That which Milyukov so timidly but so persistently strove for, Minister Tsereteli has proclaimed his own programme.

That was in the early days following the "resolving" of the crisis. Later the "socialist" Ministers became bolder and more outspoken.

On May 12 Kerensky issued his "order of the day" to the officers, soldiers and sailors:

> ". . .You will march forward, to where your leaders and your government lead you. . . . You will march . . . bound by the discipline of duty. . . . It is the will of the people that you purge our country and the world of tyrants and invaders. That is the heroic feat I call upon you to perform" (see *Rech*, May 14).

Is it not obvious that, essentially, Kerensky's order differs very little from the imperialist orders of the tsarist government, like the one that said: "We must fight the war to a victorious finish, we must drive the insolent enemy from our land, we must deliver the world from the yoke of German militarism . . ." and so on.

And as it is easier to talk about an offensive than to conduct one, and as some of the regiments of the Sev-

enth Army (four of them), for example, did not deem it possible to obey the "offensive" order, the Provisional Government, together with Kerensky, passed from words to "deeds," and ordered the "insubordinate" regiments to be disbanded immediately and threatened the culprits with "deportation to penal servitude with forfeiture of all civil and property rights" (see *Vecherneye Vremya*, June 1). And as all that too proved inadequate, Kerensky delivered himself of another "order," this time expressly directed against fraternisation, threatening to have the "culprits" "tried and punished with the utmost rigour of the law," that is, penal servitude again (see *Novaya Zhizn*, June 1).

In short, the purport of Kerensky's "orders" is: attack immediately, attack at all costs, otherwise we send you to penal servitude, or put you before a firing squad.

And this at a time when the tsarist treaties with the British and French bourgeoisie remain in force, when on the basis of these treaties "we" are being definitely forced actively to support the annexationist policy of Britain and France in Mesopotamia, in Greece, in Alsace-Lorraine!

Well, but what about a peace without annexations and indemnities? What about the pledge given by the new Provisional Government to take all "resolute measures" to achieve peace? What has become of all these promises made at the time of the "crisis of power"?

Oh, our Ministers have not forgotten about peace, about peace without annexations and indemnities; they t-a-l-k about it very volubly, talk and write, write and talk. And not only our Ministers. Only the other day, in

reply to the request of the Provisional Government to declare their war aims, the British and French governments announced that they, too, were opposed to annexations, but . . . only to the extent that this did not militate against the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, Mesopotamia, etc. And the Provisional Government, in its Note of May 31 in reply to this declaration, stated in its turn that "remaining unswervingly loyal to the common cause of the Allies," it proposed "a conference of representatives of the Allied Powers to be convened in the near future, as soon as conditions permit," for the purpose of revising the agreement on war aims (see *Rabochaya Gazeta*, No. 72). Well, as nobody knows yet when "conditions will permit," and as this so-called "near future" will at any rate not be soon, it follows that, *in fact*, the "resolute struggle" for a peace without annexations is being postponed indefinitely, is degenerating into hollow and hypocritical prating about peace. But an offensive, it appears, cannot be postponed for a single moment, and all "resolute measures" are being taken to launch it, up to and including threats of penal servitude and firing squads. . . .

There is no possible room for doubt. The war has been and remains an imperialist war. The talk about peace without annexations *in the face of* the actual preparations for an offensive is only a mask to conceal the predatory character of the war. The Provisional Government has definitely taken the path of *active* imperialism. That which only yesterday seemed impossible has become possible today, thanks to the entry of "Socialists" into the Provisional Government. By masking the imperialist nature of the Provisional Government with their

socialist phrasemongering they have strengthened and broadened the positions of the rising counter-revolution.

The position now is that "socialist" Ministers are being successfully utilised by the imperialist bourgeoisie for their counter-revolutionary purposes.

It is not the naive "revolutionary democrats" who are victorious, but those old hands at the imperialist game, Guchkov and Milyukov.

But lining up with the Right in foreign policy must inevitably lead to a similar turn in home policy; for in the midst of a world war foreign policy is the basis for all other policy, the hub of the whole life of the state.

And, indeed, the Provisional Government is more and more definitely taking the path of a "resolute struggle" against the revolution.

Only very recently it launched an offensive against the Kronstadt sailors, and at the same time prevented the peasants of the Petrograd Uyezd and the Penza, Voronezh and other gubernias from applying the elementary principles of democracy.

And several days ago Skobelev and Tsereteli made themselves famous (in the Herostratian sense!)by deporting Robert Grimm[29] from Russia, without trial, it is true, and simply by police order, but to the glee of the Russian imperialists.

But the Provisional Government's new line of home policy has been most graphically reflected by Minister Pereverzev ("also" a Socialist!). He demands nothing more nor less than the "speedy enactment of a law concerning crimes against the tranquillity of the state." Under this law (Article 129) "any person guilty of inciting publicly or in printed matter, letters or graphic

representations distributed or publicly displayed 1) to the commission of any felony, 2) to the commission of acts of violence by one section of the population against another, or 3) to disobedience of or resistance to the law or mandatory decisions or lawful orders of the authorities shall be liable to confinement in a house of correction for a period of up to three years," and "in time of war . . . to a term of penal servitude" (see *Rech*, June 4).

Such is the creative effort in the realm of penal legislation of this allegedly "socialist" Minister.

Obviously, the Provisional Government is steadily slipping into the embrace of the counter-revolutionaries.

That is also evident from the fact that in this connection that old hand at counter-revolution, Milyukov, is already smacking his lips at the prospect of another victory. "If the Provisional Government," he says, "has after long delay at last understood that the authorities possess other means besides persuasion, those very means they have already begun to employ—if it takes this path, then the conquests of the Russian revolution" (don't laugh!) "will be consolidated." . . . "Our Provisional Government has arrested Kolyshko and deported Grimm. But Lenin, Trotsky and their comrades are still at large. . . . Our wish is that at some time or other Lenin and his comrades will be sent to the same place" . . . (see *Rech*, June 4).

Such are the "wishes" of that old fox of the Russian bourgeoisie, Mr. Milyukov.

Whether the Provisional Government will meet these and similar "wishes" of Milyukov, to whose voice it generally lends an attentive ear, and whether such "wishes" are now realisable at all, the near future will show.

But one thing is beyond doubt: the Provisional Government's home policy is entirely subordinated to the requirements of its active imperialist policy.

There is only one conclusion.

The development of our revolution has entered a period of crisis. The new stage in the revolution, which is forcing its way into all spheres of economic life and revolutionising them from top to bottom, is rousing all the forces of the old and the new world. The war and the economic disruption resulting from it are intensifying class antagonisms to the utmost. The policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie, the policy of zigzagging between revolution and counter-revolution, is becoming obviously unfeasible.

One thing or the other:

Either forward against the bourgeoisie, and for transfer of power to the working people, termination of the war and economic disruption, and organisation of production and distribution;

Or backward with the bourgeoisie, for an offensive and prolongation of the war, against resolute measures for elimination of economic disruption, for anarchy in production, and for a frankly counter-revolutionary policy.

The Provisional Government is definitely taking the path of outright counter-revolution.

It is the duty of revolutionaries to close their ranks and drive the revolution forward.

Soldatskaya Pravda, No. 42,
June 13, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

AGAINST ISOLATED DEMONSTRATIONS

Several days ago the Provisional Government ordered the Anarchists to be evicted from the Durnovo villa. This essentially unjust order roused a storm of indignation among the workers. They undoubtedly regarded it as an attack on the right of existence of this or that organisation. We are opposed to the Anarchists in principle; but inasmuch as they are supported by a section of the workers, however small, they have as much right to exist as, say, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. To that extent the workers were right in protesting against the Provisional Government's attacks, the more so that, apart from the Anarchists, the villa is being used by representatives of several factories and trade unions.

Our readers know that by their protest the workers compelled the Provisional Government to yield and to leave them in possession of the villa.

It now transpires that a new workers' demonstration is being "organised" at the Durnovo villa. We are informed that meetings of factory committee representatives, headed by the Anarchists, are taking place at the villa with a view to organising a demonstration today. *If this is true*, then we declare that

we most emphatically *condemn* all isolated, anarchic demonstrations. We regard demonstrations of separate districts or regiments headed by the Anarchists, who have no understanding of present conditions, demonstrations organised against the wishes of the majority of the districts and regiments, against the wishes of the Trade Union Bureau and the Central Council of Factory Committees, and, lastly, against the wishes of the socialist party of the proletariat—we regard such anarchic demonstrations as *disastrous to the cause of the workers' revolution.*

It is right and necessary to defend the right of existence of organisations, including anarchist organisations, when attempts are made to deprive them of their premises. But to merge with the Anarchists and engage with them in reckless demonstrations which are doomed to failure beforehand is impermissible and criminal on the part of class-conscious workers.

Our comrades, the workers and soldiers, should ponder the question well: what are they, Socialists or Anarchists? and if they are Socialists, let them decide for themselves whether they can march shoulder to shoulder with Anarchists in demonstrations which are obviously ill-considered and contrary to the decision of our Party.

Comrades, by our attempt to demonstrate on June 10 we got the Executive Committee and the Congress of Soviets[30] to recognise the need for demonstrations. You no doubt know that the Congress of Soviets has appointed a general demonstration for June 18 and has declared in advance that there will be freedom of slogans.

It is now our task to see to it that the demonstration in Petrograd on June 18 marches under our revolutionary slogans.

We must therefore nip in the bud every attempt at anarchic action, in order the more energetically to prepare for the demonstration on June 18.

Oppose isolated demonstrations and support the general demonstration on June 18—that is what we urge.

Comrades, time is precious; do not lose a single moment! Let every factory, every district, every regiment and company prepare its banners inscribed with the slogans of the revolutionary proletariat. Let everyone get to work, comrades, let everyone prepare for the demonstration on June 18.

Oppose anarchic demonstrations, support the general demonstration under the banner of the party of the proletariat. Such is our call.

Pravda, No. 81,
June 14, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

RESULTS OF THE PETROGRAD MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

The elections to the (twelve) district Dumas in Petrograd are over. The general returns and other materials have not yet been published; nevertheless, data already received from the districts enable us to construct a general picture of the course and outcome of the elections.

Out of a total of more than a million electors, about 800,000 went to the polls. That is an average of 70 per cent. The abstentions were therefore by no means "ominous." The more proletarian sections of such districts as Neva and Narva (suburbs) have not yet been included in the city limits and were outside the electoral area.

The electoral contest was waged not on local, municipal issues, as is "usually" the case in Europe, but on fundamental political platforms. And this is quite understandable. At a time of extraordinary revolutionary upheaval, further complicated by war and economic disruption, when class antagonisms have been laid bare to the utmost, it is quite inconceivable that the election campaign could have been confined to local issues; the inseparable connection between local issues and the general political situation of the country was bound to come to the fore.

That is why the principal contest in the election was between three lists, corresponding to the three principal political platforms: the Cadets, the Bolsheviks and the defencists (the latter being a bloc of Narodniks, Mensheviks and the Yedinstvo). The non-party groups, which reflected political vagueness and absence of programme, were bound under such circumstances to carry no weight, and, in fact, carried none.

The choice facing the voters was:

Either backward, to a rupture with the proletariat and "resolute measures" against the revolution (*Cadets*);

Or forward, to a rupture with the bourgeoisie, a resolute struggle against the counter-revolution, and the further development of the revolution (*Bolsheviks*);

Or compromise with the bourgeoisie, a policy of zigzagging between revolution and counter-revolution, i.e., neither backward nor forward (*defencist bloc—Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries*).

The electors have made their choice. Of the 800,000 votes, over 400,000 were cast for the defencist bloc; the Cadets got a little over 160,000, without a majority in even a single district; the Bolsheviks received over 160,000 votes, and in the most proletarian district of the capital, Vyborgskaya Storona, they obtained an absolute majority. The rest of the votes (*inconsiderable*) were distributed among the thirty "non-party," "supra-party" and various other casual groups and formations.

Such is the reply of the electorate.

What does it show?

The first thing that strikes one is the weakness, the puniness of the non-party groups. The elections have

utterly refuted the fairy tale about the non-party "nature" of the average Russian citizen. The political backwardness which nourished the non-party groups has evidently become a thing of the past. The mass of the electors have definitely taken the path of *open* political struggle.

The second feature is the complete defeat of the Cadets. Wriggle as they may, the Cadets have to admit that in the first open battle under *free elections* they have been utterly routed, having failed to win a *single* district Duma. Only very recently the Cadets considered Petrograd their private domain. They declared time and again in their manifestoes that Petrograd "has confidence only in the Party of Popular Freedom," and in proof of this they pointed to the State Duma elections under the law of June 3. It has now become absolutely clear that the Cadets reigned in Petrograd by the grace of the tsar and his electoral law. It was enough for the old regime to depart from the stage, and the ground under the feet of the Cadets disappeared instantaneously.

In short, the mass of the democratic electors do not support the Cadets.

The third feature is the undoubted growth of our forces, the forces of our Party, revealed by the elections. In Petrograd our Party has 23,000 to 25,000 members; *Pravda's* circulation is from 90,000 to 100,000 copies, of which Petrograd alone accounts for 70,000; yet at the elections we obtained over 160,000 votes, i.e., seven times the number of members of our Party and twice the *Pravda* circulation in Petrograd. And that in spite of the diabolical hue and cry which practically the whole of the so-called press, from gutter-rags like *Birzhovka*

and *Vechorka* to the Ministerial *Volya Naroda*[31] and *Rabochaya Gazeta*, raised against the Bolsheviks in order to terrorise the man in the street. Needless to say, under such circumstances only the most steadfast revolutionary elements, who were not to be scared by "horrors," could have voted for our Party. These are, first of all, the leader of the revolution, the proletariat, which ensured us predominance in the Vyborg District Duma, and then the most loyal allies of the proletariat, the revolutionary regiments. It should also be noted that the free elections attracted to the polls new and broad sections of the population which had had no previous experience in the political struggle. These were, first of all, the women, and then the tens of thousands of minor officials who fill the government departments, and then the numerous "small people"—artisans, shopkeepers, etc. We did not expect, and could not have expected, that these sections would be already able to break with the "old world" and resolutely adopt the point of view of the revolutionary proletariat. Yet it was they, after all, who decided the issue of the elections. If they could turn their backs on the Cadets—as they did—this in itself is a big step forward.

In short, the mass of the electors have *already* abandoned the Cadets, but they have *not yet* come over to our Party—they have stopped halfway. On the other hand, the most resolute elements—the revolutionary proletariat and the revolutionary soldiers—have *already* rallied around our Party.

The mass of the electors have stopped halfway. And, having stopped halfway, they have found there a worthy leader—the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary bloc.

Not understanding the present-day situation, and floundering between the proletariat and the capitalists, the petty-bourgeois elector, once he had lost his faith in the Cadets, naturally gravitated towards the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who are totally confused and zigzag helplessly between revolution and counter-revolution. Like unto like! That is the whole explanation of the "brilliant victory" of the defencist bloc. And that is the fourth feature of the elections. There can be no doubt that with the further growth of the revolution the bloc's motley army will inevitably melt away, part going backward, to the Cadets, and part forward, to our Party. But meanwhile—meanwhile the leaders of the bloc can rejoice over their "victory."

And the fifth and last—but not the least!—feature of the elections is that they have concretely raised the question of power in the country. The elections have definitely revealed that the Cadets are in the minority, for only with great difficulty did they muster 20 per cent of the votes. The overwhelming majority, more than 70 per cent, were cast for the Socialists of the Right and Left wings, i.e., for the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and for the Bolsheviks. It is said that the Petrograd municipal elections are the prototype of the future elections to the Constituent Assembly. But if this be true, is it not monstrous that the Cadets, who represent only a small minority of the country, should have an overwhelming majority in the Provisional Government? How can the predominance of the Cadets in the Provisional Government be tolerated when it is obvious that the *majority* of the population have

no confidence in them? Is not this inconsistency the reason for the growing discontent with the Provisional Government which is making itself more and more manifest in the country?

Is it not clear that to permit this inconsistency to continue would be both unwise and undemocratic?

Bulletin of the Press Bureau of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P., No. 1, June 15, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

TO ALL THE TOILERS, TO ALL THE WORKERS AND SOLDIERS OF PETROGRAD[32]

Comrades,

Russia is passing through sore trials.

The war is still continuing and claiming countless lives. It is being deliberately prolonged by the *scoundrels, the bloodsucking bankers*, who grow fat on it.

The industrial disruption caused by the war is leading to the stoppage of factories and to unemployment. It is being deliberately intensified by the *lockout capitalists* in their lust for fabulous profits.

The food shortage caused by the war is becoming more and more ominous. High prices are strangling the urban poor. And prices are continually rising by the caprice of the *marauding profiteers.*

The sinister phantom of hunger and ruin is staring us in the face. . . .

Moreover, the black clouds of counter-revolution are gathering.

The Duma of June the Third which helped the tsar to oppress the people, is now demanding an immediate offensive at the front. What for? In order to drown in blood the liberty we have won, in deference to the wishes of the "Allied" and Russian robbers.

The Council of State, which supplied the tsar with hangmen-Ministers, is secretly splicing a treacherous

noose. What for? In order at a convenient moment to slip it around the necks of the people, in deference to the wishes of the "Allied" and Russian oppressors.

And the Provisional Government, planted between the tsarist Duma and the Soviet, and including ten bourgeois in its number, is clearly falling under the sway of the landlords and capitalists.

Instead of guarantees of the rights of the soldiers, we have Kerensky's "declaration" violating these rights.

Instead of consolidation of the liberties won by the soldiers in the days of the revolution, we have new "orders" threatening penal servitude and disbandment of army units.

Instead of guarantees of the liberties won by the citizens of Russia, we have political espionage in the barracks, arrests without trial, new proposals for an Article 129, carrying the threat of penal servitude.

Instead of the arming of the people, we have threats to disarm the workers and soldiers.

Instead of liberation of the oppressed peoples, we have a policy of pinpricks towards Finland and the Ukraine and fear of granting them their liberty.

Instead of a resolute struggle against counter-revolution, we have connivance at the brazenness of the counter-revolutionaries, who are openly arming to fight the revolution. . . .

And the war is still continuing, and no really serious measures are taken to stop it or to propose a just peace to *all* nations.

The economic disruption grows worse and worse, and no measures are taken to cope with it.

Famine draws nearer and nearer, and no effective measures are taken to avert it.

Is it surprising that the counter-revolutionaries are becoming more and more arrogant and are inciting the government to inflict further repressive measures on the workers and peasants, the soldiers and sailors?

Comrades, these things can no longer be tolerated in silence! To remain silent after all this would be criminal!

You are free citizens, you have the right to protest, and you must use that right before it is too late.

Let tomorrow (June 18), the day of the peaceful demonstration, become a day of formidable protest on the part of revolutionary Petrograd against resurgent oppression and tyranny!

Let the victorious banners wave tomorrow, to the dismay of the enemies of liberty and socialism!

Let your call, the call of the champions of the revolution, resound through the world, to the joy of all the oppressed and enslaved!

Over there, in the West, in the belligerent countries, the dawn of a new life, the dawn of the great workers' revolution is breaking. Let your brothers in the West know tomorrow that you have inscribed for them on your banners not war, but peace, not enslavement, but liberation!

Workers, Soldiers, clasp hands in brotherhood and march forward beneath the banner of socialism!

All out on the streets, comrades!

Rally in a close ring around your banners!

March in serried ranks through the streets of the capital!

Calmly and confidently proclaim your wishes:

Down with counter-revolution!

Down with the tsarist Duma!

Down with the Council of State!

Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!

All power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies!

Revise the "Declaration of Rights of the Soldier"!

Annul the "orders" against the soldiers and sailors!

Down with the disarming of the revolutionary workers!

Long live a people's militia!

Down with anarchy in industry and with the lockout capitalists!

Long live control and organisation of production and distribution!

No policy of offensive!

It is time to stop the war! Let the Soviet of Deputies announce just terms of peace!

Neither a separate peace with Wilhelm, nor secret treaties with the French and British capitalists!

B r e a d! P e a c e! L i b e r t y!

Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Army Organisation of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Central Council of Factory Committees of the City of Petrograd
Bolshevik Group of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies
Pravda Editorial Board
Soldatskaya Pravda Editorial Board

Pravda, No. 84,
June 17, 1917

AT THE DEMONSTRATION

The day is bright and sunny. The column of demonstrators is endless. From morn to eve the procession files towards the Field of Mars. An endless forest of banners. All factories and establishments are closed. Traffic is at a standstill. The demonstrators march past the graves with banners lowered and the *Marseillaise* and the *Internationale* give place to *You Have Fallen Victims.* The air reverberates to the roar of voices. Every now and again resound the cries: "Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!" "All power to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!" And in response loud and approving cheers ring out from all sides.

What strikes one most in surveying the demonstration is the absence of bourgeois and fellow travellers. Unlike the procession on the day of the funeral, when the workers were lost in a sea of tradesfolk and petty bourgeois, the demonstration of June 18 was essentially a proletarian demonstration, for workers and soldiers were its principal element. The Cadets had declared a boycott on the eve of the demonstration and, through their Central Committee, had urged "abstention" from

it. And, indeed, the bourgeois not only refrained from participating in it—they literally hid themselves away. The Nevsky Prospect, usually so crowded and bustling, was on that day absolutely denuded of its bourgeois frequenters.

In short, it was really a *proletarian* demonstration, a demonstration of the revolutionary workers, leading the revolutionary soldiers.

An *alliance* of the workers and soldiers *against* the bourgeois, who had deserted the field, with the lower middle class remaining *neutral*—such was the outward picture of the march of June 18.

Not a Procession but a Demonstration

The march of June 18 was not a simple promenade, a parade, as the procession on the day of the funeral undoubtedly was. It was a demonstration of protest, a demonstration of the virile forces of the revolution calculated to change the balance of forces. It is extremely characteristic that the demonstrators did not confine themselves merely to proclaiming their will, but demanded the immediate release of Comrade Khaustov,* former member of the staff of *Okopnaya Pravda*.[33] We refer to the All-Russian Conference of Army Organisations of our Party, which took part in the demonstration and demanded of the Executive Committee, in the person of Chkheidze, the release of Comrade Khaustov; and

* An ensign and a Social-Democratic Bolshevik, a namesake of the Social-Democratic Menshevik worker, former member of the Fourth State Duma.

Chkheidze promised to take all measures to secure his release "this very day."

The whole character of the slogans, which expressed protest against the "orders" of the Provisional Government and against its entire policy, showed without a doubt that the "peaceful procession," which it was intended to turn into an innocent promenade, grew into a mighty demonstration of pressure upon the government.

No Confidence in the Provisional Government

A feature that struck the eye was the fact that not a single factory and not a single regiment displayed the slogan: "Confidence in the Provisional Government!" Even the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries *forgot* (or, rather, did not dare!) to display it. They had anything you please—"No split!" "For unity!" "Support the Soviet!" "Universal education!" (believe it or not!) —but the chief thing was missing: there was no call for *confidence* in the Provisional Government, not even with the sly reservation "to the extent that. . . . " Only three groups ventured to display the confidence slogan, but even they were made to repent it. These were a group of Cossacks, the Bund group and Plekhanov's Yedinstvo group. "The Holy Trinity"—the workers on the Field of Mars ironically called them. Two of them (the Bund and the Yedinstvo) were compelled by the workers and soldiers to furl their banners amidst cries of "Down with them!" The Cossacks, who refused to furl their banner, had it torn to shreds. And one anonymous "confidence" streamer, stretched "in the air" across the

entrance to the Field of Mars, was torn down by a group of soldiers and workers while the approving public cried: "Confidence in the Provisional Government is *hanging in mid-air.*"

In short, no confidence in the government on the part of the overwhelming majority of the demonstrators, and obvious cowardly hesitation of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries to go "against the stream"—such was the general tone of the demonstration.

Bankruptcy of the Compromise Policy

Of all the slogans the most popular were: "All power to the Soviet!" "Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!" "Neither a separate peace with Wilhelm nor secret treaties with the British and French capitalists!" "Long live control and organisation of production!" "Down with the Duma and the Council of State!" "Annul the orders against the soldiers!" "Announce just terms of peace!" etc. The overwhelming majority of the demonstrators revealed their solidarity with our Party. Even such regiments as the Volhynia and Keksholm marched under the slogan "All power to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!" The members of the majority of the Executive Committee, who are in touch not with the soldier masses, but with the regimental committees, were sincerely amazed at this "unexpected surprise."

In short, the overwhelming majority of the demonstrators (who totalled 400,000 to 500,000) expressed downright lack of confidence in the policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie. The demonstration marched under the revolutionary slogans of our Party.

There is no possible room for doubt: the fairy tale about a Bolshevik "plot" has been utterly exposed. A party which enjoys the confidence of the overwhelming majority of the workers and soldiers of the capital has no need for "plots." Only an uneasy conscience, or political ignorance, could have suggested the "idea" of a Bolshevik "plot" to the "high-policy makers."

Pravda, No. 86,
June 20, 1917

Signed: *K. St.*

CLOSE THE RANKS!

The events of July 3 and 4 were called forth by the general crisis in the country. The protracted war and universal exhaustion, the incredibly high prices and undernourishment, the rising counter-revolution and the economic disruption, the disbanding of regiments at the front and the delay in settling the land question, the general state of dislocation in the country and the inability of the Provisional Government to extricate the country from the crisis—that is what drove the masses into the streets on July 3 and 4.

To attribute this action to the insidious agitation of this or that party is to adopt the point of view of the secret police, who would attribute every mass movement to the instigation of "ringleaders" and "sedition-mongers."

Neither the Bolsheviks nor any other party called for the demonstration of July 3. More than that, as late as July 3, the Bolshevik Party, the most influential in Petrograd, called upon the workers and soldiers to refrain. But when the movement broke out in spite of this, our Party, considering it had no right to wash its hands of the matter, did all it possibly could to lend the movement a peaceful and organised character.

But the counter-revolutionaries were not dozing. They organised the provocative firing; they sullied with blood the days of the demonstration and, relying on certain units from the front, they launched an offensive against the revolution. The core of the counter-revolution, the Cadet Party, as if foreseeing all this, resigned from the Cabinet beforehand and thus set its hands free. And the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries of the Executive Committee, clinging to their shaken positions, perfidiously declared a demonstration in favour of the transfer of full power to the Soviets a rebellion against the Soviets, and incited against revolutionary Petrograd the backward elements of the regiments summoned from the front. Blinded by factional fanaticism, they failed to notice that by striking at the revolutionary workers and soldiers they were weakening the whole front of the revolution and firing the hopes of the counter-revolutionaries.

The result is a riot of counter-revolution and a military dictatorship.

The wrecking of the offices of *Pravda* and *Soldatskaya Pravda*,[34] of the Trud printing plant[35] and of our district organisations, the assaults and murders, the arrests without trial and the "unauthorised" reprisals, the vile calumniation of the leaders of our Party by contemptible police spies and the vituperation of the pen pirates of the venal press, the disarming of the revolutionary workers and the disbanding of regiments, the restoration of the death penalty—there you have the "work" of the military dictatorship.

And all this on the plea of "saving the revolution," "by order" of the Kerensky-Tsereteli "Ministry," sup-

ported by the All-Russian Executive Committee. And the ruling Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties, scared by the military dictatorship, light-heartedly betray the leaders of the proletarian party to the enemies of the revolution, connive at the wrecking and rioting and take no measures to stop the "unauthorised" reprisals.

What we now have is a tacit agreement between the Provisional Government and the general staff of the counter-revolution, the Cadet Party, with the open connivance of the Executive Committee, against the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd.

And the more the ruling parties yield, the more arrogant the counter-revolutionaries become. From attacking the Bolsheviks they are now proceeding to attack all the Soviet parties and the Soviets themselves. They smash the Menshevik district organisations in Petrogradskaya Storona and Okhta. They smash the metal-workers' union branch beyond Nevskaya Zastava. They invade a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet and arrest its members (Deputy Sakharov). They organise special groups on the Nevsky Prospect to track down members of the Executive Committee. They are definitely talking of dispersing the Executive Committee, to say nothing of the "plot" against certain members of the Provisional Government and leaders of the Executive Committee.

The counter-revolutionaries grow more brazen and provocative from hour to hour. But the Provisional Government continues to disarm the revolutionary workers and soldiers on the plea of "saving the revolution." . . .

All this, coupled with the developing crisis in the country, the famine and disruption, the war and its

surprises, is adding to the acuteness of the situation and rendering new political crises inevitable.

The task now is to be prepared for the impending battles, to meet them in a fitting and organised manner.

Hence:

The first commandment: Don't allow yourselves to be provoked by the counter-revolutionaries; arm yourselves with restraint and self-control; save your strength for the coming struggle; permit no premature actions.

The second commandment: Rally more closely around our Party; close your ranks in face of the assault of our innumerable enemies; keep the banner flying; encourage the weak, rally the stragglers and enlighten the unawakened.

No compromise with the counter-revolutionaries!

No unity with the "socialist" jailers!

An alliance of the revolutionary elements against counter-revolution and those who shield it—such is our watchword.

Proletarskoye Delo
(Kronstadt), No. 2,
July 15, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin,*
Member of the Central Committee,
Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT AN EMERGENCY CONFERENCE OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)

July 16-20, 1917[36]

1. REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE JULY EVENTS

July 16

Comrades,

Our Party, and the Central Committee of our Party in particular, are accused of having incited and organised the demonstration of July 3 and 4, with the object of compelling the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets to take power, and if they refused to do so, of seizing power ourselves.

I must, first of all, repudiate these charges. On July 3, two representatives of the machine-gun regiment burst in on the Bolshevik conference and announced that the 1st Machine-Gun Regiment had come out. You will recall that we told the delegates that Party members could not go counter to the decision of their Party, and that the representatives of the regiment protested and said that they would rather resign from the Party than go against the decision of their regiment.

The Central Committee of our Party was of the opinion that in the present situation a demonstration of the workers and soldiers of Petrograd would be unwise. It

would be unwise, the C.C. considered, because it was clear that the offensive launched at the front on the government's initiative was a gamble, that the soldiers, not knowing for what aims they were being led to fight, would not go into action, and that if we were to demonstrate in Petrograd the enemies of the revolution would lay the blame on us for the failure of the offensive at the front. We wanted the blame for the collapse of the offensive to fall on those who were really responsible for this gamble.

But the demonstration had started. The machine-gunners had sent round delegates to the factories. By about 6 o'clock we were faced with the fact that vast numbers of workers and soldiers had come out. At about 5 o'clock, at the meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, I had declared officially in the name of our Central Committee and of the conference that we had decided not to demonstrate. To accuse us after this of having organised the demonstration is a lie worthy only of brazen calumniators.

The demonstration was under way. Had the Party the right to wash its hands of it and stand aloof? In view of the possibility of even more serious complications, we had no right to wash our hands of it—as the party of the proletariat we had to intervene in the demonstration and lend it a peaceful and organised character, while not setting ourselves the aim of seizing power by force of arms.

Let me remind you of a similar incident in the history of our working-class movement. On January 9, 1905, when Gapon led the masses to the tsar, our Party did not refuse to march with the masses, although it knew they were marching the devil knows where. In the present

case, when the movement was marching not under Gapon's slogans, but under our slogans, we had still less right to stand aloof from the movement. We were obliged to intervene, as a regulator, as a restraining party, in order to protect the movement from possible complications.

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries lay claim to leadership of the working-class movement, but they do not look like people capable of leading the working class. Their attacks on the Bolsheviks reveal their utter failure to understand the duties of a working-class party. They talk about this latest action of the workers like people who have broken with the working class.

That night, the Party Central Committee, the Petrograd Committee and the Army Organisation decided to intervene in this spontaneous movement of the soldiers and workers. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, seeing that more than 400,000 soldiers and workers were following us and that the ground was slipping from under their feet, declared the demonstration of the workers and soldiers to be a demonstration against the Soviets. I affirm that on the evening of July 4, when the Bolsheviks were proclaimed traitors to the revolution, it was the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who betrayed the revolution, broke the united revolutionary front, and concluded an alliance with the counter-revolutionaries. In striking at the Bolsheviks they struck at the revolution.

On July 5, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries declared martial law, set up military headquarters and handed over all affairs to the military clique. We, who were fighting for the transfer of all power to the Soviets,

were thus relegated to the position of armed opponents of the Soviets. A situation was created in which the troops of the Bolsheviks might have found themselves opposed to the troops of the Soviets. For us to accept battle under such circumstances would have been madness. We said to the leaders of the Soviets: The Cadets have resigned, form a bloc with the workers, let the government be responsible to the Soviets. But they took a perfidious step and brought out against us the Cossacks, the military cadets, hooligans and several regiments from the front, deceiving them by alleging that the Bolsheviks were going against the Soviets. It goes without saying that under these circumstances we could not accept the battle which the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were trying to force upon us. We decided to retreat.

On July 5, negotiations took place with the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, represented by Lieber. Lieber stipulated that we, that is, the Bolsheviks, should withdraw the armoured cars from the Kshesinska mansion and that the sailors should leave the Fortress of Peter and Paul and return to Kronstadt. We agreed, on condition that the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets would protect our Party organisations from possible raids. In the name of the Central Executive Committee, Lieber assured us that our conditions would be observed and that the Kshesinska mansion would remain at our disposal until we received permanent quarters. We kept our promises. The armoured cars were withdrawn and the Kronstadt sailors agreed to return, but retaining their arms. The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, however, did not keep a single one of its promises. On July 6, Kuzmin, military representative

of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, telephoned the demand that the Kshesinska mansion and the Fortress of Peter and Paul should be evacuated within three-quarters of an hour, otherwise, he threatened, armed forces would be dispatched against them. The Central Committee of our Party decided to do everything in its power to avert bloodshed. It delegated me to the Fortress of Peter and Paul, where I succeeded in persuading the sailors garrisoned there not to accept battle, since the situation had taken such a turn that we might find ourselves up against the Soviets. In my capacity as representative of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets I went with Bogdanov, the Menshevik, to see Kuzmin. Kuzmin had everything ready for action: artillery, cavalry and infantry. We argued with him not to resort to armed force. Kuzmin resented the fact that "civilians were hampering him by their constant interference," and it was only reluctantly that he agreed to comply with the demand of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets. It is clear to me that the Socialist-Revolutionary military men wanted bloodshed, so as to administer a "lesson" to the workers, soldiers and sailors. We prevented them from carrying out their perfidious plan.

Meanwhile, the counter-revolutionaries passed to the offensive: the wrecking of the *Pravda* offices and Trud printing plant, the beating up and murder of our comrades, the suppression of our newspapers, and so on. The counter-revolutionaries are led by the Central Committee of the Cadet Party; behind them are the general staff and commanding officers of the army—who are representatives of the bourgeoisie that wants to continue the war because it is waxing fat on it.

Day by day the counter-revolutionaries entrenched themselves more strongly. Every time we applied to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets for explanations we became convinced that it was incapable of preventing excesses, that the power was not in the hands of the Central Executive Committee but in the hands of the Cadet military clique that was setting the tone for the counter-revolutionaries.

Ministers are falling like ninepins. There is a move to replace the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets by an Extraordinary Conference in Moscow,[37] where among the hundreds of outright representatives of the bourgeoisie the 280 members of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets would be drowned like flies in milk.

The Central Executive Committee, scared by the growth of Bolshevism, is concluding a shameful alliance with the counter-revolutionaries and complying with their demands, namely, to surrender the Bolsheviks, arrest the Baltic delegates[38] and disarm the revolutionary soldiers and workers. All this is arranged very simply: with the aid of shots fired by provocateurs the defencist clique create a pretext for disarming the workers and then proceed to disarm them. This was the case with the Sestroretsk workers,[39] who took no part in the demonstration.

The first sign of every counter-revolution is the disarming of the workers and revolutionary soldiers. Here this vile counter-revolutionary work has been done by the hand of Tsereteli and the other "socialist Ministers" of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets. Therein lies the whole danger. The "government of salvation of the revolution" is "consolidating" the revolution by strangling it.

Our task is to muster our forces, strengthen the existing organisations and restrain the masses from premature action. It is to the advantage of the counter-revolutionaries to provoke us to fight now; but we must not yield to the provocation, we must display the utmost revolutionary restraint. This is the general tactical line of the Central Committee of our Party.

As to the infamous slander that our leaders are backed by German gold, the position of the Party Central Committee is this. Allegations of treason have been levelled against the revolutionary leaders of the proletariat in all bourgeois countries—against Liebknecht in Germany, against Lenin in Russia. The Party Central Committee is not surprised that the Russian bourgeois resort to this tried and tested method of fighting "undesirable elements." The workers must declare openly that they regard their leaders as irreproachable, that they are with them solidly, and that they consider themselves partners in their cause. The workers themselves have applied to the Petrograd Committee for a draft of a resolution protesting against the scurrilous attacks on our leaders. The Petrograd Committee has drafted such a resolution, which will be covered with workers' signatures.

Our opponents, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, have forgotten that events are not called forth by individuals but by the subterranean forces of the revolution, and have thus adopted the stand of the secret police.

You know that *Pravda* has been suppressed since July 6 and that the Trud printing plant has been sealed up. The intelligence department says that in all probability it will be reopened when the investigation is

completed. While they are idle we shall have to pay about 30,000 rubles to the compositors and office staffs of *Pravda* and the printing plant.

After the July events, and after what has happened since, we cannot regard the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks as Socialists. The workers now call them social-jailers.

To talk about unity with the social-jailers after this would be criminal. We must put forward another slogan: Unity with their Left wing, with the internationalists, who still retain a modicum of revolutionary integrity and who are prepared to fight the counter-revolution.

Such is the line of the Central Committee of the Party.

2. REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION

July 16

Comrades,

The outstanding feature of the present situation is a crisis of power. Around this question other, minor questions are grouped. The crisis of power is due to the shakiness of the government: a time has come when its orders are greeted with either ridicule or indifference, and nobody wants to carry them out. Distrust of the government is penetrating to the depths of the people. The government is tottering. That is what is at the bottom of the crisis of power.

This is the third crisis of power we are witnessing. The first was the crisis of tsarist government, which is now defunct. The second was the crisis of the first Provisional Government, which resulted in the resignation of Milyukov and Guchkov. The third is the crisis of

the coalition government, when government instability has reached its apex. The socialist Ministers are handing in their portfolios to Kerensky, and the bourgeoisie express their distrust of him. A cabinet was formed, and the very next day it proved to be equally unstable.

As Marxists we must not regard the crisis of power solely from the formal angle; we must look at it primarily from the class angle. The crisis of power is a tense and open struggle of classes for power. The result of the first crisis was that the power of the landlords gave way to the power of the bourgeoisie, which was supported by the Soviets, "representing" the interests of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. The result of the second crisis was an agreement between the big bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie in the shape of a coalition government. As in the first crisis, so in the second, the government fought the revolutionary demonstrations of the workers (February 27 and April 20-21). The second crisis was resolved "in favour" of the Soviets by "Socialists" from the Soviets entering the bourgeois cabinet. In the third crisis the soldiers and workers are openly calling for the assumption of power by the working people—the petty-bourgeois and proletarian democracy—and the elimination of all capitalist elements from the government.

What is the cause of the third crisis?

The whole "blame" is now being thrown on the Bolsheviks. The demonstration of July 3 and 4 was allegedly a factor which intensified the crisis. Karl Marx said long ago that every forward step of the revolution calls forth a backward step of the counter-revolution in reply. Regarding the demonstration of July 3 and 4 as a revo-

lutionary step, the Bolsheviks accept the compliment paid them by the socialist renegades of being the pioneers of the forward movement. But this crisis of power has not been settled in favour of the workers. Who is to blame for that? Had the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries supported the workers and Bolsheviks, the counter-revolution would have been vanquished. But they began to fight the Bolsheviks, they smashed the united front of revolution, with the result that the crisis is proceeding under circumstances unfavourable not only for the Bolsheviks but also for them, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

That was the first factor which intensified the crisis.

The second factor was the resignation of the Cadets from the government. The Cadets sensed that things were tending to grow worse, that the economic crisis was spreading and that money was running low, so they decided to slip out. Their departure was a continuation of Konovalov's boycott. The Cadets were the first to leave the government, having realised its instability.

The third factor which revealed and intensified the crisis of power was the defeat of our armies at the front. The war is now the basic issue, on which all other issues in the home and foreign affairs of the country hinge. And on this basic issue the government has failed. It was clear from the very first that the offensive at the front was a gamble. There are rumours that hundreds of thousands of our men have been taken prisoner and that the soldiers are fleeing in disorder. To attribute the "disruption" at the front exclusively to Bolshevik agitation is to exaggerate the influence of the Bolsheviks. No single party can carry so much weight. How our Party, which

has about 200,000 members, could "demoralise" the army, when the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, which represents 20,000,000 citizens, could not retain its influence over the army would want some explaining. The fact is that the soldiers do not want to fight, because they don't know what they are fighting for; they are weary, they are worried by the question of the distribution of the land, and so on. To hope that the soldiers could be led into action under these circumstances was to hope for a miracle. The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets was in a position to carry on far more extensive agitation in the army than we, and it did; nevertheless, the great spontaneous resistance to the war carried the day. It is not we who are to blame; it is the revolution that is "to blame," inasmuch as it gave every citizen the right to demand an answer to the question: what is the war being fought for?

Hence, the crisis of power is due to three factors:

1) The dissatisfaction of the workers and soldiers with the government, whose policy they regarded as being too Right;

2) The dissatisfaction of the bourgeoisie with the government, whose policy they regarded as being too Left; and

3) The reverses at the front.

These are the surface forces which brought about the crisis of power.

But at the bottom of them all is the subterranean force which brought about the crisis, namely, the economic disruption of the country caused by the war. From this source alone sprang the three factors which have shaken the authority of the coalition government.

If the crisis is a battle of classes for power, then we, as Marxists, must ask: Which class is now rising to power? The facts show that it is the working class that is rising to power. Clearly, the bourgeois class will not allow it to take power without a fight. The petty bourgeoisie, which comprises the majority of the population of Russia, wavers, uniting now with us, now with the Cadets, thus throwing the last weight into the scales. This is the class content of the crisis of power we are now witnessing.

Who are the vanquished and who the victors in this crisis? Evidently in this instance the power is being assumed by the bourgeoisie, represented by the Cadets. At one moment, when the Cadets resigned from the government, the power was in the hands of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets; but it surrendered the power and requested the members of the government to form a cabinet. Now the Central Executive Committee is an appendage of the government; a reshuffling of Ministers is going on in the cabinet; Kerensky alone has remained. Somebody is dictating his will, which both the Ministers and the Central Executive Committee have to carry out. Evidently, this is the will of the organised bourgeoisie, the Cadets in the first place. It is dictating its terms; it is demanding a government not of party representatives but of "competent persons," withdrawal of Chernov's agrarian programme, amendment of the government declaration of July 8,[40] and elimination of the Bolsheviks from all organs of authority. The Central Executive Committee is yielding to the bourgeoisie and consenting to its terms.

How could it happen that the bourgeoisie, which yesterday was still in retreat, is today giving orders

to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets? The explanation is that after the defeat at the front the government has lost credit with the foreign bankers. There is evidence worthy of the most serious attention which indicates that the hand of Ambassador Buchanan and the bankers is at work here; they are refusing credits to the government unless it abandons its "socialist" leanings.

That is the first reason.

The second reason is that the bourgeois front is better organised than the revolutionary front. When the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries united with the bourgeoisie and began to strike at the Bolsheviks, the counter-revolutionaries realised that the united revolutionary front was broken. Organised in military and imperialist financial cliques headed by the Central Committee of the Cadet Party, the counter-revolutionaries presented a number of demands to the defencists. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, trembling for their power, hastened to carry out these demands of the counter-revolutionaries.

That is the background against which the victory of the counter-revolutionaries was enacted.

It is clear that at this juncture the counter-revolutionaries have beaten the Bolsheviks because the Bolsheviks have been isolated, betrayed by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. But it is likewise clear that a favourable moment will come when we shall be able to give decisive battle to the bourgeoisie.

The counter-revolutionaries have two centres. One is the party of the organised bourgeoisie, the Cadets, who are shielded by the defencist Soviets. Its executive organ

is the general staff, headed by prominent generals in whose hands all the threads of the command are concentrated. The second centre is the imperialist financial clique, which is connected with Britain and France and in whose hands all the threads of credit are concentrated. It is not for nothing that Yefremov, member of the Inter-Parliamentary Commission which controls the credits, has been brought into the government.

These facts account for the victory of the counter-revolution over the revolution.

What are the prospects? As long as the war continues —and it will continue; as long as the industrial disruption is not overcome—and it will not be overcome, because it cannot be overcome by repressive measures against the soldiers and workers, and the ruling classes cannot take heroic measures; as long as the peasants do not receive land—and they will not receive land, because even Chernov with his moderate programme proved to be an undesirable member of the government—as long as all this goes on, crises will be inevitable, the masses will come out into the streets again and again, and there will be determined battles.

The peaceful period of development of the revolution has come to an end. A new period has begun, a period of sharp conflicts, clashes, collisions. Times will be turbulent, crisis will follow crisis. The soldiers and workers will not remain silent. Twenty regiments protested even against the suppression of *Okopnaya Pravda*. The fact that new Ministers have been pushed into the government has not solved the crisis. The working class has not been reduced to impotence. The working class has proved to be more sensible than its enemies thought. When it

realised that the Soviets had betrayed it, it declined to accept battle on July 4 and 5. And the agrarian revolution is only just gathering momentum.

We must meet the impending battles in a fitting and organised manner.

Our main tasks should be:

1) To urge the workers, soldiers and peasants to display restraint, fortitude and organisation;

2) To revive, strengthen and expand our organisations;

3) Not to neglect any legal opportunities, for no counter-revolution can really drive us underground.

The period of unbridled and violent repression has passed; a period of "legal" persecution is setting in, and we must seize upon and utilise every opportunity the law permits us.

In view of the fact that the Bolsheviks have been isolated because the majority in the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets have betrayed us by concluding an alliance with the counter-revolutionaries, the question arises what our attitude should be towards the Soviets and their majority, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. At the meeting of the Central Executive Committee Martov accused Gotz and Dan of having come with decisions already adopted at meetings of the Black Hundreds and the Cadets. The persecution of the Bolsheviks has shown that they are left without allies. The news of the arrest of our leaders and the suppression of our papers was greeted by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries with thunderous applause. To talk about unity with the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries after that is to extend a hand to counter-revolutionaries.

I say this because efforts are being made here and there in the factories to arrange an alliance of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries with the Bolsheviks. That is a camouflaged form of fighting the revolution, for alliance with the defencists may bring about the doom of the revolution. There are elements among the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who are prepared to fight the counter-revolutionaries (the Kamkovites[41] among the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the Martovites among the Mensheviks), and with these we are ready to join in a united revolutionary front.

3. REPLIES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

July 16

1) *Maslovsky*: In the event of future conflicts and possibly armed actions, to what extent will our Party assist, and will it head an armed protest?

Stalin: It is to be presumed that there will be armed actions, and we must be prepared for all contingencies. The future conflicts will be sharper, and the Party must not wash its hands of them. Saln, speaking in the name of the Lettish district, reproached the Party for not assuming leadership of the movement. But that is not so, because the Party did in fact set out to direct the movement into peaceful channels. We might be reproached for not striving to take power. We could have taken power on July 3 and 4; we could have compelled the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets to sanction our taking power. But the question is, could we have retained power? The front, the provinces and a number of local Soviets would have risen against us. Power which did

not rest upon the provinces would have proved to be baseless. By taking power under such circumstances we would have disgraced ourselves.

2) *Ivanov*: What is our attitude towards the slogan "Power to the Soviets!"? Is it not time to call for "dictatorship of the proletariat"?

Stalin: When a crisis of power is resolved, it means that a certain class has come to power—in this case, the bourgeoisie. Can we, then, continue to adhere to the old slogan "All power to the Soviets!"? Of course, not. To transfer power to the Soviets, which in fact are tacitly working hand in glove with the bourgeoisie, would mean helping the enemy. When we are victorious we can transfer the power only to the working class, supported by the poorer strata of the rural population. We must advocate another, a more expedient form of organisation of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. The form of power remains as before, but we change the class content of the slogan, and we say in the language of the class struggle: All power to the workers and poor peasants, who will conduct a revolutionary policy.

3) *Anonymous*: What should we do if the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies were to declare that the minority must submit to the majority? Would we withdraw from the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, or not?

Stalin: We already have a decision on this point. The Bolshevik group held a meeting at which a reply was drawn up to the effect that as members of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets we submit to all decisions of the Central Executive Committee and

refrain from opposing them, but as members of the Party we may act independently, since there is no doubt that the existence of the Soviets does not annul the independent existence of parties. Our reply will be announced at the meeting of the Central Executive Committee tomorrow.

4. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION

July 16

Comrades,

For the purpose of drafting a resolution on our attitude towards the decision of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets regarding the Bolsheviks, a commission was elected, of which I was a member. It has drafted a resolution which reads: As members of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets we submit to the majority, but as members of the Bolshevik Party we may act independently even in opposition to the decisions of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets.

Prokhorov understands the dictatorship of the proletariat to mean the dictatorship of our Party. But we speak of the dictatorship of the class which leads the poorer strata of the peasantry.

Inexactitudes in some of the speeches: What are we confronted with, reaction or counter-revolution? In time of revolution there is no such thing as reaction. When one class replaces another in power, this is not reaction but revolution or counter-revolution.

As for the fourth factor responsible for the crisis of power to which Kharitonov referred, the international factor, only the war and the questions of foreign policy

connected with the war have had any bearing on our crisis of power. In my report I attributed chief importance to the war as a factor responsible for it.

As for the petty bourgeoisie, it is no longer an integral whole; it is undergoing a process of rapid differentiation (the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies of the Petrograd Garrison, which is going counter to the Executive Committee of the Peasants' Congress). A struggle is going on in the rural districts and side by side with the existing Soviets of Peasants' Deputies new and spontaneous ones are springing up. It is on the support of these poorer strata of the peasantry which are now rising to the surface that we count. They alone, because of their economic position, can go along with us. Those strata of the peasantry which have put people so avid for the blood of the proletariat as Avksentyev on the Executive Committee of the Peasants' Congress will not follow us and will not swing our way. I saw how these people applauded when Tsereteli announced the order for the arrest of Comrade Lenin.

The comrades who say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible because the proletariat constitutes a minority of the population interpret the strength of a majority mechanically. Even the Soviets represent only the 20,000,000 people they have organised, but thanks to their organisation they have the following of the whole population. The whole population will follow an organised force that can break the shackles of economic disruption.

Comrade Volodarsky's interpretation of the resolution adopted by the conference differs from mine, but what his view is it is hard to make out.

Some comrades ask whether we may change our slogan. Our slogan of power to the Soviets was adapted to the peaceful period of development of the revolution, which has now passed. We must not forget that one of the conditions for the transfer of power now is victory over the counter-revolution through an uprising. When we advanced the slogan about the Soviets, the power was actually in the hands of the Soviets. By bringing pressure to bear upon the Soviets we could influence changes in the government. Now the power is in the hands of the Provisional Government. We can no longer count on securing the peaceful transfer of power to the working class by bringing pressure to bear on the Soviets. As Marxists we must say: it is not a matter of institutions, but of the policy of which class the given institution is carrying out. Unquestionably we are in favour of Soviets in which we have the majority. And we shall strive to create such Soviets. But we cannot transfer power to Soviets which have entered into an alliance with the counter-revolutionaries.

What I have said may be summed up as follows: The peaceful path of development of the movement has come to an end, because the movement has entered the path of socialist revolution. The petty bourgeoisie, except for the poorer strata of the peasantry, is now supporting the counter-revolutionaries. Therefore, at the present stage the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" has become obsolete.

First published in 1923,
in the magazine *Krasnaya Letopis*, No. 7

WHAT HAS HAPPENED?

The date was July 3 and 4. The workers and soldiers were marching together in procession through the streets of Petrograd demanding: "All power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!"

What did the workers and soldiers want, what were they seeking to attain?

Was it the overthrow of the Soviets?

Of course, not!

What the workers and soldiers wanted was that the Soviets should take all power into their own hands and alleviate the hard lot of the workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors.

They wanted to strengthen the Soviets, not to weaken or destroy them.

They wanted the Soviets to assume power, break with the landlords, and turn over the land to the peasants at once, without delay.

They wanted the Soviets to assume power, break with the capitalists, and improve conditions of labour and establish workers' control in the mills and factories.

They wanted the Soviets to proclaim just terms of peace and to put an end at long last to this grim war which is carrying off millions of young lives.

That is what the workers and soldiers wanted.

But the leaders of the Executive Committee, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, had no desire to follow the path of revolution.

Rather than alliance with the revolutionary peasantry, they preferred agreement with the landlords.

Rather than alliance with the revolutionary workers, they preferred agreement with the capitalists.

Rather than alliance with the revolutionary soldiers and sailors, they preferred alliance with the military cadets and Cossacks.

They perfidiously declared the Bolshevik workers and soldiers enemies of the revolution and turned their weapons against them, in deference to the wishes of the counter-revolutionaries.

Blind fools! They failed to observe that in firing upon the Bolsheviks they were firing upon the revolution and paving the way for the triumph of counter-revolution.

It was for this reason that the counter-revolutionaries, who until then had been lying low, crawled out into the open.

The breach of the front which began at that juncture, and which revealed the utter disastrousness of the defencists' policy, still further fired the hopes of the counter-revolutionaries.

And the counter-revolutionaries did not fail to take advantage of the "blunders" of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Having intimidated and entrapped them, and having tamed them and won them over to their own side, the counter-revolutionary ringleaders, the Milyukov gentry,

launched a campaign against the revolution. Wrecking and suppression of newspapers, disarming of the workers and soldiers, arrests and manhandling, lies and slanders, vile and despicable calumniation of the leaders of our Party by venal police sleuths—such are the fruits of the policy of compromise.

Things have reached such a pitch that the Cadets, grown brazen, are issuing ultimatums, threatening, terrorising, abusing and vilifying the Soviets, while the scared Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are surrendering position after position, and, under the blows of the Cadets, the brave Ministers are falling like ninepins and clearing the way for Milyukov's placemen, for the sake of . . . "salvation" . . . of the revolution.

Is it to be wondered, then, that the counter-revolutionaries are jubilant with victory?

Such is the state of affairs now.

But it cannot last for long.

The victory of the counter-revolutionaries is a victory for the landlords. But the peasants cannot live any longer without land. A resolute struggle against the landlords is therefore inevitable.

The victory of the counter-revolutionaries is a victory for the capitalists. But the workers cannot rest content without a radical improvement of their lot. A resolute struggle against the capitalists is therefore inevitable.

The victory of the counter-revolutionaries means the continuation of the war. But the war cannot continue for long, because the whole country is suffocating under its burden.

The victory of the counter-revolutionaries is therefore insecure and evanescent.

The future is on the side of a new revolution.

Only the establishment of the full power of the people can give the peasants land, bring order into the economic life of the country, and ensure peace, which is so essential for the suffering and exhausted peoples of Europe.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 1,
July 23, 1917

Unsigned

VICTORY OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION[42]

The counter-revolution has organised. It is spreading and attacking all along the line. Its leaders, the Cadet gentry, who only yesterday were boycotting the government, are today prepared to return to office in order to act as the masters in the country.

The "ruling" parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, and their government of the "salvation of the revolution" are retreating in utter disarray. They are ready to make any concession, to consent to everything—only give the order.

Hand over the Bolsheviks and their followers?

"Certainly, Messieurs the Cadets, you can have the Bolsheviks."

Hand over the Baltic delegation and the Kronstadt Bolsheviks?

"At your service, Messieurs the 'Intelligence Service,' you can have the delegation."

Suppress the Bolshevik newspapers, the workers' and soldiers' newspapers, which are not to the liking of the Cadets?

"Glad to oblige, Messieurs the Cadets; we'll suppress them."

Disarm the revolution—the workers and soldiers?

"With the greatest of pleasure, Messieurs the Landlords and Capitalists. We'll disarm not only the Petrograd workers, but the Sestroretsk workers as well, although they had no part in the events of July 3 and 4."

Restrict freedom of speech and assembly, inviolability of person and domicile, and introduce a censorship and a secret police?

"It shall be done, Messieurs the Blacks. Everything without fail."

Restore the death penalty at the front?

"With pleasure, Messieurs the Insatiables." . . .

Dissolve the Finnish Diet, which supports the platform of the Soviet?

"Right away, Messieurs the Landlords and Capitalists."

Revise the government's programme?

"Willingly, Messieurs the Cadets."

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are prepared to go farther still along the road of concession, so long as they can strike a bargain with the Cadets, any sort of bargain. . . .

But the counter-revolutionaries are growing increasingly brazen and are demanding more and more sacrifices, driving the Provisional Government and the Executive Committee to ignominious depths of self-abdication. In deference to the Cadets it is proposed to convene an "Extraordinary Assembly" in Moscow, consisting of members of the already abolished State Duma and of other representatives of the propertied classes, a coterie in which the Central Executive Committee will be a wretched minority. The Ministers have lost their heads

and are piling their portfolios at Kerensky's feet. At the dictation of the Cadets a list of members of the government is being drawn up.

The liberty purchased with blood is being stifled with the aid of the tsarist Duma and the traitor Cadets—such are the depths of shame to which we are being reduced by our present helmsmen of state. . . .

But the war goes on, adding to the calamities at the front. And they think that by reintroducing the death penalty at the front they can improve the situation. Blind fools! They do not realise that an offensive can count on mass support only when the aims of the war are clearly understood and shared by the army, when the army knows that it is shedding its blood in a cause that is vitally its own. They do not realise that without this knowledge a mass offensive is inconceivable in a democratic Russia where the soldiers are free to hold meetings and assemblies.

And the economic disruption grows more profound, threatening famine, unemployment and general ruin. They think they can end the economic crisis by resorting to police measures against the revolution. Such is the will of the counter-revolutionaries. Blind fools! They do not realise that the country cannot be saved from collapse unless revolutionary measures are taken against the bourgeoisie.

Workers are being hounded, organisations wrecked, the peasants cheated, soldiers and sailors arrested, leaders of the proletarian party slandered and libelled, and at the same time the counter-revolutionaries have grown insolent and are jubilating and calumniating—and all this under the guise of "saving" the revolution. Such

is the pass we have been brought to by the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties.

Yet there are people (see *Novaya Zhizn*) who after all this propose that we unite with these gentry who are "saving" the revolution by strangling it!

What do they take us for?

No, sirs, we can have no truck with people who are betraying the revolution.

The workers will never forget that in the grim ordeal of the July days, when the infuriated counter-revolutionaries opened fire on the revolution, the Bolsheviks were the only party that did not desert the working-class districts.

The workers will never forget that at that grim moment the "ruling" parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, were in one camp with those who were crushing and disarming the workers, soldiers and sailors.

All this the workers will remember and they will draw the proper conclusions.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 1,
July 23, 1917

Signed: *K. St.*

THE VICTORY OF THE CADETS

Evidently the Ministerial shuffle is not yet over. The Cadets and Kerensky are still bargaining. One "combination" is followed by another.

The Cadets, of course, will enter the government, for it is they who call the tune. Chernov may remain. Tsereteli, evidently, is "not wanted" any longer. Tsereteli "was needed" for the purpose of disarming the workers. Now that the workers are disarmed, he is of no more use. "The Moor has done his work, he can go."[43] He will be replaced by Avksentyev.

But it is not a question of personalities, of course. Chernov, Tsereteli, or anyone else of the same breed—what difference does it make? Everyone knows that these pseudo-Zimmerwaldists served the cause of imperialism no worse than the Hendersons and Thomases.[44]

But, I repeat, it is not a question of personalities.

The point is that in all this turmoil, in this chase after portfolios and the like, at the bottom of which is a struggle for power, the line of the Cadets, the line of counter-revolution in home policy, and of a "war to a finish" in foreign policy, has gained the upper hand.

For the question at issue was:

Either the war goes on—in which case complete dependence on the British and American money market, the rule of the Cadets, and the revolution curbed; for neither the Cadets nor "Allied" capital can sympathise with the Russian revolution.

Or, transfer of power to the revolutionary class, the breaking of the financial shackles of Allied capital which bind Russia hand and foot, declaration of terms of peace, and rehabilitation of the disrupted national economy at the expense of the profits of the landlords and capitalists.

There was no third way, and the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who sought for a third way, were bound to go down.

In this respect the Cadets proved more clear-headed.

"The government must resolutely break with the disastrous trends of Zimmerwaldism and 'utopian' socialism," writes *Rech.*

In other words, war without reservations, war to a finish.

"There must be a definite conclusion," said Nekrasov at the conference: Either take power yourselves (he was addressing the Soviet), or let others take power!

In other words, either revolution or counter-revolution.

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had abandoned the path of revolution, hence they were inevitably bound to fall under the sway of the Cadets, of the counter-revolutionaries.

For the Cadets mean an assured internal loan.

The Cadets mean friendship with Allied capital, that is, an assured foreign loan.

And, owing to the disruption in the rear and especially at the front, money is needed so badly. . . .

That is the whole essence of the "crisis."

And that is the whole significance of the victory of the Cadets.

Whether this victory will be enough for long the near future will show.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 2,
July 24, 1917

Editorial

TO ALL THE TOILERS, TO ALL THE WORKERS AND SOLDIERS OF PETROGRAD[45]

Comrades,

These are dire times for Russia.

The three years of war have claimed countless victims and have reduced the country to a state of exhaustion.

The dislocation of transport and the disruption of food supplies are fraught with the menace of wholesale starvation.

Industrial disruption and the stoppage of factories are shaking the very foundation of our national economy.

But the war goes on and on, intensifying the general crisis and leading towards the utter collapse of the country.

The Provisional Government, whose mission it was to "save" the country, has proved incapable of performing its task. More, it has made things still worse by launching an offensive at the front and thereby prolonging the war, which is the principal cause of the general crisis in the country.

The result is a state of complete government instability, that crisis and breakdown of authority about which

everyone is clamouring, but to eliminate which no serious measures are being taken.

The resignation of the Cadets from the government was an additional demonstration of the utter artificiality and impracticability of a coalition Ministry.

And the retreat of our armies at the front, after their well-known offensive, revealed how fatal the offensive policy was, thereby intensifying the crisis to the utmost, undermining the prestige of the government and depriving it of credits from the bourgeoisie, "home" and "Allied."

The situation was critical.

Two courses were open to the "saviours" of the revolution.

Either to continue the war and launch another "offensive," which would mean the inevitable transfer of power to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, so that money might be obtained by means of internal and foreign loans—for otherwise the bourgeoisie would not join the government, an internal loan could not be raised and Britain and America would refuse credits—"saving" the country in this case implies defraying the cost of the war out of the pockets of the workers and peasants, in the interests of the Russian and "Allied" imperialist sharks.

Or to transfer power to the workers and poor peasants, announce democratic terms of peace and stop the war, in order to advance the revolution and turn the land over to the peasants, establish workers' control in industry and restore the collapsing national economy at the expense of the profits of the capitalists and landlords.

The first course implies strengthening the power of the propertied classes over the toilers and converting Russia into a colony of Britain, America and France.

The second course would open up an era of workers' revolutions in Europe, break the financial bonds that entangle Russia, shake the very foundation of bourgeois rule and pave the way for the real emancipation of Russia.

The demonstration of July 3 and 4 was a call of the worker and soldier masses to the socialist parties to adopt the second course, the course of developing the revolution further.

That was its political import and therein lay its great historical significance.

But the Provisional Government and the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Ministerial parties, which draw their strength not from the revolutionary actions of the workers and peasants, but from compromise arrangements with the Cadet bourgeoisie, preferred the first course, the course of adaptation to the counter-revolutionaries.

Instead of extending a hand to the demonstrators and with them, after taking over power, waging a struggle against the "Allied" and "home" imperialist bourgeoisie for the real salvation of the revolution, they entered into an alliance with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and turned their weapons against the demonstrators, against the workers and soldiers, by setting the military cadets and Cossacks on them.

Thereby they betrayed the revolution, and threw the gates wide open for counter-revolution.

And the sordid dregs rose from the depths and began to swamp all that is honourabe and noble.

Police searches and raids, arrests and manhandling, torture and murder, suppression of newspapers and organisations, disarming of the workers and disbanding of regiments, dissolution of the Finnish Diet, restriction of liberties and the reintroduction of the death penalty, carte blanche to hooligans and secret agents, lies and filthy slanders, and all with the tacit consent of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks—such are the first steps of the counter-revolution.

The Allied and Russian imperialists and the Cadet Party, the higher army officers and the military cadets, the Cossacks and the secret service—these are the forces of the counter-revolution.

These groups dictate the lists of members of the Provisional Government, and ministers appear and disappear like puppets.

It is at the behest of these groups that the Bolsheviks and Chernov are betrayed, that regiments and naval crews are purged, that soldiers are shot and units disbanded at the front, that the Provisional Government is made a plaything of Kerensky, and the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets a mere accessory of this plaything, that the "revolutionary democracy" shamefully renounces its rights and duties, and that the rights of the tsarist Duma, which was abolished only so recently, are restored.

Things have gone so far that at the "historic conference"[46] in the Winter Palace (July 21) an unambiguous agreement (conspiracy!) was reached to tighten the

curb on the revolution, and, from fear of exposure by the Bolsheviks, the latter were not invited to the conference.

And still to come is the projected "Moscow Conference," at which they intend completely to strangle the liberty won at the price of blood. . . .

All this with the collaboration of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who are cravenly surrendering position after position, humbly chastising themselves and their organisations and criminally trampling upon the gains of the revolution. . . .

Never have the "representatives" of the democracy behaved so ignominiously as in these historic days!

Never before have they sunk to such shameful depths!

Is it then to be wondered that the counter-revolutionaries have grown brazen and are besmirching everything honourable and revolutionary with mud?

Is it then to be wondered that venal hirelings and cowardly slanderers have the effrontery openly to "accuse" the leaders of our Party of "treason"; that the pen pirates of the bourgeois press insolently splash this "accusation"; that the so-called prosecuting authorities barefacedly published so-called evidence on "the Lenin case," and so on?

These gentry evidently count on disorganising our ranks, on sowing doubt and dismay in our midst, on breeding distrust of our leaders.

Miserable wretches! They do not know that never have our leaders been so near and dear to the working class as today, when the bourgeois scum have grown insolent and are throwing mud at them!

Venal mercenaries! They do not suspect that the viler the scurrility of the hirelings of the bourgeoisie, the stronger is the love of the workers for their leaders, and the greater their confidence in them; for they know from experience that when the enemy abuses the leaders of the proletariat it is a sure sign that the leaders are serving the proletariat honestly.

Messrs. the Alexinskys and Burtsevs, the Pereverzevs and Dobronravovs—accept our gift, the shameful brand of unscrupulous slanderers! We present it to you in the name of the 32,000 organised workers of Petrograd who elected us. Accept it, and wear it to your grave. You deserve it.

And you, Messieurs the capitalists and landlords, bankers and profiteers, priests and secret service spies, who are all forging chains for the peoples—you are celebrating victory too early. If you think the time has come for you to bury the Great Russian Revolution, you are out in your reckoning.

The revolution lives, worthy gravediggers, and it will yet make its power felt.

The war and the economic disruption are continuing, and the wounds they are causing cannot be healed by savage repressions.

The subterranean forces of the revolution are alive and are carrying on their tireless work of revolutionising the country.

The peasants have not yet received land. They will fight, because without land they cannot live.

The workers have not yet achieved control over the mills and factories. They will fight for it, because industrial disruption threatens them with unemployment.

The soldiers and sailors are being pushed back into the old discipline. They will fight for liberty, because they have earned the right to it.

No, Messieurs the counter-revolutionaries, the revolution is not dead; it is only lying low, in order to muster new followers and then hurl itself upon its enemies with redoubled energy.

"We live! Our scarlet blood seethes with the fire of unspent strength!"

And over there, in the West, in Britain and Germany, in France and Austria—is not the banner of the workers' revolution already flying, are not Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies already being formed?

There will be battles yet!

There will be victories still!

The thing is to be ready to meet the coming battles in fitting and organised fashion.

Workers, to you has fallen the honour of being the leader of the Russian revolution. Rally the masses around you and muster them under the banner of our Party. Remember that in the grim July days, when the enemies of the people were firing on the revolution, the Bolsheviks were the only party that did not desert the working-class districts. Remember that in those grim days the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were in one camp with those who suppressed and disarmed the workers.

Muster under our banner, comrades!

Peasants, your leaders have not justified your hopes. They have followed in the wake of the counter-revolutionaries and you remain without land; for as long as the counter-revolutionaries prevail you will not get the

landed estates. Your only true allies are the workers. Only in alliance with them will you secure land and liberty. Rally, then, around the workers!

Soldiers, the strength of the revolution lies in the alliance of the people and the soldiers. Ministers come and go, but the people remains. Be, then, always with the people and fight in its ranks!

Down With the Counter-revolution!

Long Live the Revolution!

Long Live Socialism and the Fraternity of Peoples!

Petrograd City Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks)

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 2,
July 24, 1917

TWO CONFERENCES[47]

Two conferences. Both city conferences, Petrograd conferences.

One a Menshevik conference. The other a Bolshevik conference.

The first representing 8,000 workers in all.

The second representing 32,000.

The first a scene of chaos and disintegration, for it is on the point of splitting into two.

The second a scene of unity and solidarity.

The first derives its strength from compromise with the Cadet bourgeoisie. And it is for this very reason that it is divided, for there are still honest people among the Mensheviks who refuse to follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie.

The second, on the contrary, derives its strength not from arrangements with the bourgeoisie, but from the revolutionary struggle of the workers against the capitalists and landlords.

The first believes that the "salvation of the country" lies in eradicating Bolshevism and betraying the revolution.

The second believes that it lies in sweeping away the counter-revolutionaries and their "socialist" hangers-on.

They say that Bolshevism is dead and buried.

But our esteemed gravediggers are showing undue haste in burying us. We are still alive, and the bourgeoisie will have plenty of occasion to start and tremble at the sound of our voice.

On the one hand, 32,000 united Bolsheviks standing for the revolution; on the other, 8,000 disunited Mensheviks the majority of whom have betrayed the revolution. Make your choice, comrade workers!

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 2,
July 24, 1917

Unsigned

THE NEW GOVERNMENT

The Ministerial shuffle is over. A new government has been formed. Cadets, pro-Cadets, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks—such is its composition.

The Cadet Party is satisfied. Its major demands have been accepted. They will serve as the basis of the activities of the new government.

The Cadets wanted the government strengthened at the expense of the Soviets, and they wanted it to be independent of the Soviets. The Soviets, led by "bad shepherds" from the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, have conceded this, thus signing their own death warrant.

The Cadets have got what they wanted: the Provisional Government is now the sole authority.

The Cadets demanded "restoration of the army's morale," that is, "iron discipline" in the army, and its subordination only to its immediate commanders, who, in their turn, would be subordinate only to the government. The Soviets, led by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, have conceded this too, thus disarming themselves.

The Cadets have got what they wanted: the Soviets deprived of the army, and the army subordinated only to a government made up of pro-Cadet elements.

The Cadets demanded unconditional unity with the Allies. The Soviets have "resolutely" accepted this course in the interests of . . . "national defence," forgetting their "internationalist" declarations. And the so-called programme of July 8 has become a dead letter.

The Cadets have got what they wanted: a war "without mercy," a "war to a finish."

Listen to the Cadets themselves:

"The Cadets' demands have undoubtedly been accepted as the basis of the activities of the whole government. . . . Precisely for this reason, its major demands having been accepted, the Cadet Party thought it unwise to prolong the dispute because of specifically party disagreements." For the Cadets know that under present conditions "very little time or opportunity will be left for the democratic elements of the notorious programme of July 8" (see *Rech*).

That's clear enough.

There was a time when the Soviets were building a new life, introducing revolutionary changes and compelling the Provisional Government to confirm these changes by its decrees and ukases.

That was in March and April.

At that time the Provisional Government followed the lead of the Soviets and lent its non-revolutionary flag to the Soviets' revolutionary measures.

A time has now come when the Provisional Government has turned back and is introducing counter-revolutionary "changes," while the Soviets find themselves "compelled" tacitly to endorse them in their milk-and-water resolutions.

The Central Executive Committee, the representative of all the Soviets, is now following the lead of the Provi-

sional Government and is masking the latter's counter-revolutionary physiognomy with revolutionary phrase-mongering.

Roles, evidently, have changed, and not in favour of the Soviets.

Yes, the Cadets have reason to be "satisfied."

Whether for long, the near future will show.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 3,
July 26, 1917

Editorial

THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS[48]

The Constituent Assembly election campaign has begun. The parties are already mobilising their forces. The prospective candidates of the Cadets are already touring the country, sounding their chances of success. The Socialist-Revolutionaries have convened a conference of gubernia peasant representatives in Petrograd for the purpose of "organising" the elections. Another group of Narodniks is convening a congress of the All-Russian Peasants' Union[49] in Moscow for the same purpose. Simultaneously, non-party "Garrison Soviets of Peasants' Deputies" are spontaneously springing up, for the purpose, among other things, of seeing to it that the election campaign is effectively conducted in the countryside. For the same purpose numerous societies are being formed by workers originating from the same rural areas, and are sending persons and literature to the villages. Lastly, individual factories are sending special delegates to carry on election propaganda in rural areas. This quite apart from the innumerable individual "delegates," mainly soldiers and sailors, who are travelling the country and bringing the peasants "news from the towns."

Evidently, the significance of the moment and the cardinal importance of the Constituent Assembly are

appreciated by the broadest sections of the population. And everyone feels that the rural districts, which represent the majority of the population, will play the decisive role, and that it is there that all available forces should be sent. All this, coupled with the fact that the agricultural labourers—the principal support of our Party in the rural districts—are scattered and unorganised, greatly adds to the difficulty of our work in the countryside. Unlike the urban workers, who are the most highly organised section of the urban population, the rural labourers are the most unorganised. The Soviets of Peasants' Deputies chiefly organise the middle and well-to-do sections of the peasantry, who are naturally inclined to compromise "with the liberal landlord and capitalist." It is they, too, who lead the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements of the rural districts and bring them under the influence of the compromising Trudovik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties. The inadequate development of agricultural capitalism and of the class struggle in the countryside creates favourable conditions for such a compromising policy.

The immediate task of our Party is to deliver the poorer strata of the peasantry from the influence of the Trudoviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and to unite them with the urban workers in one fraternal family.

Developments themselves are working in this direction, step by step exposing the futility of the policy of compromise. The task of our Party workers is to intervene in the Constituent Assembly elections to the utmost for the purpose of disclosing the perniciousness of this policy, and thus help the poorer strata of the peasantry to rally around the urban proletariat.

For this purpose it is necessary immediately to create nuclei of our Party in the rural areas and link them closely with the Party committees in the towns. We must form Party groups of poor peasants, men and women, in every volost, in every uyezd, in every constituency. These groups must be connected with our committees in the industrial centres of the particular gubernia. It should be the duty of these committees to supply the groups with the necessary election material, literature and cadres.

Only in this way and in the course of the campaign itself will it be possible to create real unity between the proletarians of town and country.

We are opposed to agreement with the capitalists and landlords, because we know that the interests of the workers and peasants can only suffer from such agreement.

But that does not mean that we are opposed to all agreements in general.

We are in favour of agreement with the non-party groups of propertyless peasants which life itself is impelling on to the path of revolutionary struggle against the landlords and capitalists.

We are in favour of agreement with the non-party organisations of soldiers and sailors which are imbued with confidence, not in the rich but in the poor, not in the government of the bourgeoisie but in the people, and, above all, in the working class. To repel such groups and organisations because they cannot or do not want to merge with our Party would be unwise and harmful.

That is why our election campaign in the rural districts must aim at finding a common language with such

groups and organisations, at working out a common revolutionary platform, at drawing up joint lists of candidates with them in all the constituencies, which should include not "professors" and "savants," but peasants, soldiers and sailors who are prepared staunchly to back the demands of the people.

Only in that way will it be possible to rally the broad strata of the rural toiling population around the leader of our revolution, the proletariat.

There is no need to make a long search for such non-party groups, for they are springing up continually everywhere. And they will continue to spring up owing to the growing distrust in the Provisional Government, which is preventing the Peasant Committees from disposing of the landed estates. They are growing and will continue to grow owing to the dissatisfaction with the policy of the All-Russian Executive Committee of Peasants' Deputies, which is following in the wake of the Provisional Government. An example of this is the recently formed "Soviet of Peasants' Deputies of Petrograd,"[50] which embraces the entire garrison of the city, and which from its very inception came into conflict with the Provisional Government and the All-Russian Executive Committee of Peasants' Deputies.

The following is a model platform that might serve as a basis of agreement with such non-party organisations of peasants and soldiers:

1. We are opposed to the landlords and capitalists and their "Party of Popular Freedom," because they, and they alone, are the chief enemies of the Russian people. No confidence in, and no support for, the rich and their government!

2. We give our confidence and support to the working class, the devoted champion of socialism; we are for alliance and agreement of the peasants, soldiers and sailors with the workers against the landlords and capitalists.

3. We are opposed to the war, for it is a war of conquest. Any talk about peace without annexations will remain empty prating so long as the war is waged on the basis of the secret treaties concluded by the tsar with the British and French capitalists.

4. We are in favour of the speediest ending of the war by means of a determined struggle of the peoples against their imperialist governments.

5. We are opposed to the anarchy in industry, which is being aggravated by the capitalists. We are in favour of workers' control over industry; we are in favour of industry being organised on democratic lines by the intervention of the workers themselves and of a government recognised by them.

6. We are in favour of the organisation of proper exchange of products between town and country, so that the towns may be supplied with sufficient quantities of provisions and the countryside with sugar, paraffin, footwear, textiles, hardware and other necessary goods.

7. We are in favour of all the land—appanage, state, crown, landlord, monastery and church—being transferred to the whole people without compensation.

8. We are in favour of all unused land, arable and grazing, belonging to the landlords, being placed *immediately* at the disposal of democratically elected Peasant Committees.

9. We are in favour of all unused draft animals and farm implements now in the possession of landlords or in warehouses being placed *immediately* at the disposal of the Peasant Committees to be used for purposes of tillage, mowing, harvesting, etc.

10. We are in favour of all disabled soldiers, as well as widows and orphans, being paid allowances adequate to maintain a decent human existence.

11. We are in favour of a people's republic, without a standing army, bureaucracy, or police force.

12. In place of a standing army we demand a national guard with elected commanders.

13. In place of a non-accountable bureaucratic officialdom we demand that government servants be elected and subject to recall.

14. In place of a police exercising tutelage over the people we demand a militia chosen by election and subject to recall.

15. We are in favour of the annulment of the "orders" directed against the soldiers and sailors.

16. We are opposed to the disbanding of regiments and the incitement of soldier against soldier.

17. We are opposed to the persecution of the workers' and soldiers' press; we are opposed to restriction of free speech and assembly whether in the rear or at the front; we are opposed to arrests without trial; we are opposed to disarmament of the workers.

18. We are opposed to the reintroduction of the death penalty.

19. We are in favour of all the nations of Russia being granted the right freely to arrange their lives in their

own way, and of none of them being subjected to oppression.

20. Lastly, we are in favour of all power in the country being turned over to the revolutionary Soviets of Workers and Peasants, for only such power can lead the country out of the impasse into which it has been driven by the war, the economic disruption and the high cost of living, and by the capitalists and landlords, who are battening on the people's need.

Such, in general, is the platform that might serve as a basis of agreement between our Party organisations and the non-party revolutionary groups of peasants and soldiers.

Comrades, the elections are approaching. Intervene before it is too late and organise the election campaign.

Set up mobile groups of propagandists consisting of working men and women, soldiers and sailors, and arrange short lectures on the subject of the platform.

Furnish these groups with literature and send them out to the four corners of Russia.

Let their voice arouse the countryside to the forthcoming elections to the Constituent Assembly.

Set up Party groups in the volosts and uyezds and rally the mass of the poor peasantry around them.

Organise conferences in volosts, uyezds and gubernias for the purpose of strengthening revolutionary party connections and nominating candidates to the Constituent Assembly.

The importance of the Constituent Assembly is immense. But immeasurably greater is the importance of the masses who are outside the Constituent Assembly. The source of strength will not be the Constituent Assem-

bly itself, but the workers and peasants who by their struggle are creating a new revolutionary law and will impel the Constituent Assembly forward.

Know that the more organised the revolutionary masses are, the more attentively will the Constituent Assembly heed their voice, and the more assured will be the future of the Russian revolution.

The chief task in the elections, therefore, is to rally the broad mass of the peasantry around our Party.

To work, comrades!

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 4,
July 27, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)

July 26-August 3, 1917[51]

1. REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

July 27

Comrades,

The Central Committee's report embraces its activities during the past two and a half months—May, June and the early half of July.

The Central Committee's activities in the month of *May* were directed along three lines.

First, it issued the call for new elections to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The Central Committee proceeded from the fact that our revolution was developing along peaceful lines, and that the composition of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and hence of the government, could be altered by new elections to the Soviets. Our opponents accused us of trying to seize power. That was a calumny. We had no such intention. We said that we had the opportunity by means of new elections to the Soviets to change the character of the activity of the Soviets and make it conform with the wishes of the broad masses. It was clear to us that a majority of one vote in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies would be enough to make the government take a different course. New elections were

therefore the keynote of our work in the month of May. In the end we won about half the seats in the workers' group of the Soviet, and about one quarter in the soldiers' group.

Second, agitation against the war. We took the occasion of the death sentence passed on Friedrich Adler[52] to organise a number of protest meetings against capital punishment and against the war. That campaign was well received by the soldiers.

The third aspect of the Central Committee's activities was the municipal elections in May. Jointly with the Petrograd Committee, the Central Committee exerted every effort to give battle both to the Cadets, the main force of counter-revolution, and to the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who willingly or unwillingly followed the Cadets. We secured about 20 per cent of the 800,000 votes cast in Petrograd. The Vyborg District Duma we won entirely. Outstanding service was rendered the Party by our soldier and sailor comrades.

Thus the outstanding features in May were: 1) the municipal elections; 2) agitation against the war, and 3) the elections to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

June. Rumours of preparation for an offensive at the front were making the soldiers restless. A series of orders were issued abrogating the rights of the soldiers. All this electrified the masses. Every rumour spread through Petrograd like wildfire, stirring up unrest among the workers and especially the soldiers. Rumours of an offensive; Kerensky's orders and declaration of the rights of the soldier; the unburdening of Petrograd of "unnecessary" elements—as the authorities termed it, it

being clear, however, that what they wanted was to rid Petrograd of revolutionary elements; the economic disruption, which was becoming ever more tangible—all this was making the workers and soldiers restless. Meetings were organised at the factories, and we were being constantly urged by regiments and factories to organise a demonstration. It was planned to hold a demonstration on June 5. But the Central Committee resolved not to hold a demonstration for the time being, but to convene a meeting of representatives of the districts, factories, mills and regiments on June 7 and to decide there the question of a demonstration. This meeting was called and was attended by about 200 persons. It became evident that the soldiers were particularly restless. By an overwhelming majority of votes it was decided to demonstrate. The question was debated as to what should be done if the Congress of Soviets, which had just opened, should declare against a demonstration. The vast majority of the comrades who took the floor were of the opinion that nothing could prevent the demonstration from being held. After that the Central Committee decided to take it upon itself to organise a peaceful demonstration. The soldiers wanted to know whether they could not come armed, but the Central Committee resolved against the carrying of arms. The soldiers, however, said that it was impossible to come unarmed, that arms were the only effective guarantee against excesses on the part of the bourgeois public, and that they would bring arms only for purposes of self-defence.

On June 9 the Central Committee, the Petrograd Committee and the Army Organisation held a joint meeting. The Central Committee raised the following point: in

view of the fact that the Congress of Soviets and all the "socialist" parties were opposed to our demonstration, would it not be well to postpone it? All replied in the negative.

At midnight the same day the Congress of Soviets issued a manifesto in which it brought the whole weight of its authority against us. The Central Committee resolved not to hold the demonstration on June 10 and to postpone it to June 18, seeing that on that day the Congress of Soviets was itself calling a demonstration, at which the masses would be able to express their will. The workers and soldiers greeted the Central Committee's decision with repressed dissatisfaction, but obeyed it. It is characteristic, comrades, that on the morning of June 10, when a number of speakers from the Congress of Soviets addressed factory meetings urging the "liquidation of the attempt to organise a demonstration," the overwhelming majority of the workers agreed to listen only to the speakers of our Party. The Central Committee succeeded in pacifying the soldiers and workers. This was indicative of our high level of organisation.

When arranging the demonstration for June 18 the Congress of Soviets announced that freedom of slogans would be allowed. It was evident that the Congress had decided to give battle to our Party. We accepted the challenge, and began to muster our forces for the coming demonstration.

The comrades know how the demonstration of June 18 went off. Even the bourgeois papers said that the overwhelming majority of the demonstrators marched under the slogans of the Bolsheviks. The principal slogan was "All power to the Soviets!" No fewer than 400,000

persons marched in the procession. Only three small groups—the Bund, the Cossacks and the Plekhanovites—ventured to display the slogan "Confidence in the Provisional Government!"—and even they repented it, for they were compelled to furl their banners. The Congress of Soviets was given proof positive of how great the strength and influence of our Party was. It was the general conviction that the demonstration of June 18, which was more imposing than the demonstration of April 21, was bound to have its effect. And it should indeed have had its effect. *Rech* averred that in all probability there would be important changes in the government, because the policy of the Soviets was not approved by the masses. But that very day our armies launched an offensive at the front, a successful offensive, and the "Blacks" began a demonstration on the Nevsky Prospect in honour of it. That obliterated the moral victory gained by the Bolsheviks at the demonstration. It also obliterated the chances of the practical results which had been spoken of by both *Rech* and official spokesmen of the ruling parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

The Provisional Government remained in power. The successful offensive, partial successes of the Provisional Government, and a number of projects to withdraw the troops from Petrograd had their effect on the soldiers. These facts convinced them that passive imperialism was changing to active imperialism. They realised that a period of fresh sacrifices had begun.

The front reacted to the policy of active imperialism in its own way. A whole number of regiments, in spite of orders to the contrary, began to take a vote on the question of whether to attack or not. The higher com-

mand failed to realise that in the new conditions prevailing in Russia, and in view of the fact that the aims of the war were not clear, it was impossible to hurl the masses blindly into an offensive. What we had predicted occurred: the offensive was doomed to failure.

The latter part of June and the beginning of July were dominated by the policy of the offensive. Rumours were circulating about the restoration of the death penalty, about the disbandment of a whole number of regiments, and about soldiers at the front being subjected to maltreatment. Delegates arrived from the front with reports of the arrest and beating up of soldiers in their own units. There were similar reports from the grenadier regiment and the machine-gun regiment. All this prepared the ground for another demonstration of the workers and soldiers of Petrograd.

I now come to the events of July 3-5. It all began on July 3, at three in the afternoon, at the premises of the Petrograd Committee.

July 3, 3 p. m. The Petrograd City Conference of our Party was in session. The most inoffensive of questions was being discussed—the municipal elections. Two representatives of one of the regiments of the garrison appeared. They raised a matter of urgency. Their regiment had "decided to come out this evening," because they "could not stand it any longer in silence when regiment after regiment was being disbanded at the front," and they had "already sent round their delegates to the factories and regiments" inviting them to join the demonstration. In reply to this, Comrade Volodarsky, speaking for the presidium of the conference, said that "the Party

had already decided not to demonstrate, and Party members in the regiment must not dare to disobey the Party's decision."

4 p.m. The Petrograd Committee, Army Organisation and Central Committee of the Party, having discussed the question, resolve not to demonstrate. The resolution is approved by the conference, whose members disperse to the factories and regiments to dissuade the comrades from demonstrating.

5 p.m. A meeting of the Bureau of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets in the Taurida Palace. On the instructions of the Central Committee of the Party, Comrade Stalin makes a statement to the Bureau of the Central Executive Committee on what has occurred, and reports that the Bolsheviks have decided against a demonstration.

7 p.m. In front of the headquarters of the Petrograd Committee. Several regiments march up with banners displaying the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" They stop in front of the Petrograd Committee premises and request that members of our organisation "say a few words." Two Bolshevik speakers, Lashevich and Kurayev, explain the current political situation and urge against demonstrating. They are received with cries of "Get down!" Members of our organisation then suggest that the soldiers elect a delegation to convey their wishes to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets and then disperse to their regiments. This proposal is greeted with deafening cheers. The band plays the *Marseillaise*.... By this time the news flies round Petrograd that the Cadets have resigned from the government, and the workers become restless. Following the soldiers, columns of work-

ers appear. Their slogans are the same as the soldiers'. The soldiers and the workers march off to the Taurida Palace.

9 p.m. Headquarters of the Petrograd Committee. A succession of delegates arrives from the factories. They all request our Party organisations to join in and assume direction of the demonstration. Otherwise there "will be bloodshed." Voices are raised suggesting that delegations should be elected from the mills and factories to make the will of the demonstrators known to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, and that the masses, after hearing the reports of the delegations, should disperse peacefully.

10 p. m. Meeting of the Workers' Section of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in the Taurida Palace. In consequence of the reports of the workers that the demonstration has already begun, the majority of the section decide to join in the demonstration in order to avert excesses and to lend it a peaceful and organised character. A minority do not agree with this decision and walk out of the meeting. The majority elect a bureau to carry out the decision just adopted.

11 p.m. The Central Committee and Petrograd Committee of our Party shift their meeting place to the Taurida Palace, to which the demonstrators have been marching all the evening. Agitators from the districts and representatives from the factories arrive. Representatives of the Central Committee of our Party, the Petrograd Committee, the Army Organisation, the Mezhrayonny Committee and the Bureau of the Workers' Section of the Petrograd Soviet hold a meeting. The reports from the districts make it clear:

1) That the workers and soldiers cannot be restrained from demonstrating the following day;

2) That the demonstrators will carry arms exclusively for self-defence, as an effective guarantee against provocative shots that may be fired from the Nevsky Prospect: "It's not so easy to fire on armed men."

The meeting decides that at a time when the revolutionary worker and soldier masses are demonstrating under the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" the party of the proletariat has no right to wash its hands of and stand aloof from the movement; it cannot abandon the masses to the caprice of fate; it must remain with the masses in order to lend the spontaneous movement a conscious and organised character. The meeting decides to recommend the workers and soldiers to elect delegates from the regiments and factories and through them declare their wishes to the Executive Committee of the Soviets. An appeal for a "peaceful and organised demonstration" is drawn up on the lines of this decision.[53]

Midnight. Over 30,000 Putilov workers arrive at the Taurida Palace with banners displaying the slogan: "All power to the Soviets!" Delegates are elected. The delegates report the demands of the Putilov workers to the Executive Committee. The soldiers and workers in front of the Taurida Palace begin to disperse.

July 4. Daytime. The procession of workers and soldiers, carrying banners and Bolshevik slogans, marches to the Taurida Palace. The tail of the procession consists of thousands of sailors from Kronstadt. There are no fewer than 400,000 demonstrators—according to the bourgeois papers (*Birzhovka*). The streets are scenes of jubilation. Friendly cheers from the public

greet the demonstrators. In the afternoon excesses begin. Sinister elements in the bourgeois districts cast a dark shadow over the workers' demonstration by firing provocative shots. Even *Birzheviye Vedomosti* does not venture to deny that the shooting was started by opponents of the demonstration. "Precisely at two o'clock," it writes (July 4, evening edition), "on the corner of the Sadovaya and the Nevsky Prospect, as the armed demonstrators were filing past and large numbers of the public were quietly looking on, a deafening report came from the right side of the Sadovaya, after which shots began to be fired in volleys."

Obviously, it was not the demonstrators that started the shooting; it was "unknown persons" who fired on the demonstrators, not vice versa.

Firing went on simultaneously in several places in the bourgeois part of the town. The provocators were not dozing. Nevertheless, the demonstrators did not go beyond necessary self-defence. There was absolutely no sign of a conspiracy or insurrection. Not a single government or public building was seized, nor even was an attempt made to do so, although, with the tremendous armed force at their disposal, the demonstrators could quite easily have captured not only individual buildings, but the whole city. . . .

8 p.m. At the meetings of the Central Committee, the Mezhrayonny Committee and other organisations of our Party in the Taurida Palace it is decided that now that the revolutionary workers and soldiers have demonstrated their will, the action should be stopped. An appeal is drawn up on these lines: "The demonstration is over.... Our watchword is: Staunchness, restraint, calm"

(see the appeal in *Listok Pravdy*[54]). The appeal was sent to *Pravda* but could not appear on July 5, because on the night of the 4th the *Pravda* offices were wrecked by military cadets and secret agents.

10-11 p.m. In the Taurida Palace the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets discusses the question of the government. After the resignation of the Cadets the position of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks has become very critical: they "need" a bloc with the bourgeoisie, but a bloc is impossible because the bourgeoisie want no more agreements with them. A bloc with the Cadets is no longer feasible. Hence the question of the Soviets taking over power themselves arises with full force.

There are rumours that our front has been pierced by the Germans. True, these rumours are still unconfirmed, but they cause uneasiness.

There are rumours that on the following day a statement will appear in the press containing an infamous slander against Comrade Lenin.

The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets calls out soldiers (of the Volhynia regiment) to protect the Taurida Palace. From whom? From the Bolsheviks, it appears, who have allegedly come to the palace to "arrest" the Executive Committee and "seize power." That is said of the Bolsheviks, who had been advocating the strengthening of the Soviets and the transference to them of all authority in the country! . . .

2-3 a.m. The Central Executive Committee of the Soviets does not assume power. It instructs the "socialist" Ministers to form a new government and to get at least a few bourgeois into it. The Ministers are furnished with emergency powers to "combat anarchy." The matter

is clear: the Central Executive Committee, faced with the necessity of resolutely breaking with the bourgeoisie —which it particularly fears to do, because it has hitherto derived its strength from "combinations" in one form or another with the bourgeoisie—responds by resolutely breaking with the workers and the Bolsheviks, in order to join with the bourgeoisie and turn its weapons against the revolutionary workers and soldiers. Thus a campaign is launched against the revolution. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks open fire on the revolution, to the glee of the counter-revolutionaries. . . .

July 5. The papers (*Zhivoye Slovo*[55]) publish the statement with the infamous slander against Comrade Lenin. *Pravda* does not appear, because its offices were wrecked on the night of July 4. A dictatorship of the "socialist" Ministers, who are seeking a bloc with the Cadets, is established. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who had not wanted to take power, now take it (for a short period) in order to crush the Bolsheviks. . . . Army units from the front appear in the streets. Gangs of military cadets and counter-revolutionaries go about wrecking, making searches and committing acts of ruffianism. The witch-hunt against Lenin and the Bolsheviks raised by Alexinsky, Pankratov and Pereverzev is exploited to the full by the counter-revolutionaries. The counter-revolution hourly gains momentum. The hub of the dictatorship is the military headquarters. The secret service agents, the military cadets, the Cossacks run riot. Arrests and manhandlings. The open attack of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets against the Bolshevik workers and soldiers unleashes the forces of counter-revolution. . . .

In reply to the slanders of Alexinsky and Co., the Central Committee of our Party issues the leaflet, "Try the Slanderers!"[58] The Central Committee's appeal to call off the strike and demonstration (which could not appear in *Pravda* because of the wrecking of its offices) appears as a separate leaflet. One is struck by the absence of any appeals from the other "socialist" parties. The Bolsheviks are alone. Against them have tacitly combined all the elements to the Right of the Bolsheviks—from Suvorin and Milyukov to Dan and Chernov.

July 6. The bridges have been raised. The pacifier Mazurenko and his composite detachment are doing their punitive work. In the streets, troops are suppressing recalcitrants. There is a virtual state of siege. "Suspects" are arrested and taken to military headquarters. Workers, soldiers and sailors are being disarmed. Petrograd has been placed under the power of the military. Much as the "powers that be" would like to incite a so-called "battle," the workers and soldiers do not succumb to the provocation and do not "accept battle." The Fortress of Peter and Paul opens its gates to the disarmers. The premises of the Petrograd Committee are occupied by a composite detachment. Searches are conducted and weapons confiscated in the working-class districts. Tsereteli's idea of disarming the workers and soldiers, which he first timidly formulated on June 11, is now being carried into effect. "Minister of Disarmament" the workers bitterly call him. . . .

The Trud printing plant is wrecked. *Listok Pravdy* appears. A worker, Voinov, is killed while distributing the *Listok*. . . . The bourgeois press throws off all restraint; it represents the infamous slander against Com-

rade Lenin as a fact, and now does not confine its attack on the revolution to the Bolsheviks alone, but extends it to the Soviets, the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries.

It becomes clear that in betraying the Bolsheviks the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have betrayed themselves, have betrayed the revolution, and have unleashed and unbridled the forces of counter-revolution. The campaign of the counter-revolutionary dictatorship against liberty in the rear and at the front is in full swing. From the fact that the Cadet and Allied press, which only yesterday was still carping at revolutionary Russia, now suddenly feels satisfied, it may be concluded that the "work" of pacification was not undertaken without the Russian and Allied moneybags taking part in the campaign.

2. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION

July 27

Comrades,

It is evident from the discussion that no one criticises the political line of the Central Committee of the Party or objects to its slogans. The Central Committee put forward three major slogans: all power to the Soviets, control of production, and confiscation of the landed estates. These slogans won sympathy among the mass of the workers and among the soldiers. They proved to be correct, and by waging the fight on that basis we retained the support of the masses. I consider this a major fact in the Central Committee's favour. If it issues correct slogans at the most difficult moments,

this shows that in the main the Central Committee is right.

Criticism has centred not around primary, but secondary matters. It amounted in substance to the claim that the Central Committee had not formed contacts with the provinces and that its activities had been confined chiefly to Petrograd. The reproach of isolation from the provinces is not without foundation. But it was utterly impossible to cover the entire provinces. The reproach that the Central Committee virtually became a Petrograd Committee is to some extent justified. This is a fact. But it is here, in Petrograd, that the policy of Russia is being hammered out. It is here that the directing forces of the revolution are located. The provinces react to what is done in Petrograd. This, finally, is due to the fact that this is the seat of the Provisional Government, in whose hands all the power is concentrated, and the seat of the Central Executive Committee, which is the voice of the whole organised revolutionary democracy. On the other hand, events are moving fast, an open struggle is in progress, and there is no assurance that the existing government may not disappear any day. Under such circumstances, to wait until our friends in the provinces say their word was quite unthinkable. We know that the Central Executive Committee decides questions concerning the revolution without waiting for the provinces. The whole government apparatus is in their hands. And what have we got? The apparatus of the Central Committee. And it is, of course, a weak apparatus. To demand, therefore, that the Central Committee take no steps without first consulting the provinces is tantamount to demanding that the Central Com-

mittee should not march ahead of events but trail behind them. But then it would not be a Central Committee. Only by following the method which we did follow could the Central Committee be equal to the situation.

Reproaches have been voiced on particular points. Some comrades spoke of the failure of the insurrection of July 3-5. Yes, comrades, failure there was; only it was not an insurrection, but a demonstration. This failure was due to the breach of the front of the revolution resulting from the treacherous conduct of the petty-bourgeois parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who turned their backs on the revolution.

Comrade Bezrabotny[57] said that the Central Committee made no effort to flood Petrograd and the provinces with leaflets explaining the events of July 3-5. But our printing plant had been wrecked, and it was physically impossible to get anything printed in other printing plants, as this would have exposed them to the danger of being wrecked likewise.

All the same, things here were not so bad: if in some of the districts we were arrested, in others we found a welcome and were greeted with extraordinary enthusiasm. And now, too, the spirit of the Petrograd workers is splendid and the prestige of the Bolsheviks is immense.

I should like to raise a few questions.

Firstly, how should we react to the slanders against our leaders? Recent events make it necessary to draw up a manifesto to the people explaining all the facts, and for this purpose a commission should be elected. And I propose that this commission, if you decide to elect it, should also issue a manifesto to the revolutionary

workers and soldiers of Germany, Britain, France, etc., informing them of the events of July 3-5 and branding the calumniators. We are the most advanced section of the proletariat, we are responsible for the revolution, and we must tell the whole truth about the events and expose the infamous slanderers.

Secondly, about the refusal of Lenin and Zinoviev to appear for "trial." Just now it is still unclear who holds the power. There is no guarantee that if they do appear they will not be subjected to brutal violence. If the court were democratically organised and if a guarantee were given that violence would not be committed, it would be a different matter. In reply to our inquiries at the Central Executive Committee we were told, "We cannot say what may happen." Consequently, so long as the situation remains unclarified, so long as the silent struggle between official power and actual power continues, there is no sense in our comrades appearing for "trial." If, however, at the head there will be a power which can guarantee our comrades against violence, they will appear.

3. REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION

July 30

Comrades,

To discuss the political situation of Russia is to discuss the development of our revolution, its victories and defeats in the midst of an imperialist war.

As early as February it was apparent that the main forces of our revolution were the proletariat and the peasants whom the war has put into soldier's uniform.

It so happened that in the struggle against tsarism there were in the same camp as these forces, and as though in alliance with them, other forces—the bourgeois liberals and Allied capital.

The proletariat was, and remains, the mortal foe of tsarism.

The peasants put their faith in the proletariat and, seeing that they would not receive land unless tsarism was overthrown, followed the proletariat.

The bourgeois liberals were disillusioned in tsarism and turned their backs on it, because it had not only failed to win them new markets but was even unable to retain the old ones, having surrendered fifteen gubernias to Germany.

Allied capital, the friend and well-wisher of Nicholas II, was also "compelled" to betray tsarism, because the latter had not only failed to ensure the "united front" it desired, but was clearly preparing to conclude a separate peace with Germany into the bargain.

Tsarism thus found itself isolated.

This indeed explains the "amazing" fact that tsarism so "silently and imperceptibly passed away."

But the aims pursued by these forces differed completely.

The bourgeois liberals and British and French capital wanted to make a *little* revolution in Russia similar to that of the Young Turks, in order to rouse the ardour of the masses and exploit it for a *big* war, while the power of the capitalists and landlords at bottom remained unshaken.

A little revolution for the sake of a big war!

The workers and peasants, on the other hand, were

out for a thorough break-up of the old order, for what we call a great revolution, in order to overthrow the landlords and curb the imperialist bourgeoisie so as to put an end to the war and ensure peace.

A great revolution and peace!

It was this fundamental contradiction that underlay the development of our revolution and of each and every "crisis of power."

The "crisis" of April 20 and 21 was the first open manifestation of this contradiction. If in this series of "crises" success so far has on every occasion been with the imperialist bourgeoisie, it is to be attributed not only to the high degree of organisation of the counter-revolutionary front, headed by the Cadet Party, but primarily to the fact that the compromising parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, which vacillate in favour of imperialism, and which so far have the following of the broad masses, every time broke the front of revolution, deserted to the camp of the bourgeoisie, and so gave the front of counter-revolution the advantage.

So it was in April.

So it was in July.

The "principle" of coalition with the imperialist bourgeoisie advocated by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries has proved in practice to be a most pernicious weapon, with the help of which the party of the capitalists and landlords, the Cadets, isolating the Bolsheviks, step by step consolidated its position with the helping hand of these same Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. . . .

The lull which set in at the front in March, April and May was taken advantage of to develop the revolu-

tion further. Spurred on by the general disruption in the country, and encouraged by the possession of liberties which not a single one of the belligerent countries enjoys, the revolution drove deeper and deeper and began to put forward social demands. It invaded the economic sphere, demanding workers' control in industry, nationalisation of the land and supply of farm implements to the poor peasants, organisation of proper exchange between town and country, nationalisation of the banks and, lastly, the assumption of power by the proletariat and the poorer strata of the peasantry. The revolution came squarely up against the necessity for socialist changes.

Some comrades say that since capitalism is poorly developed in our country, it would be utopian to raise the question of a socialist revolution. They would be right if there were no war, if there were no economic disruption, if the foundations of the capitalist organisation of the national economy were not shaken. The question of intervening in the economic sphere is arising in all countries as something essential in time of war. This question has also arisen of sheer necessity in Germany, where it is being settled without the direct and active participation of the masses. The case is different here in Russia. Here the disruption has assumed more ominous proportions. On the other hand, nowhere is there such freedom in time of war as in our country. Then we must bear in mind the high degree of organisation of our workers; for instance, 66 per cent of the metalworkers of Petrograd are organised. Lastly, the proletariat in no other country has, or has had, such broad organisations as the Soviets of Workers' and

Soldiers' Deputies. Possessing the maximum liberty and organisation, the workers naturally could not, without committing political suicide, abstain from actively interfering in the economic life of the country in favour of socialist changes. It would be rank pedantry to demand that Russia should "wait" with socialist changes until Europe "begins." That country "begins" which has the greater opportunities. . . .

Inasmuch as the revolution had advanced so far, it could not but arouse the vigilance of the counter-revolutionaries; it was bound to stimulate counter-revolution. This was the first factor which mobilised the counter-revolution.

A second factor was the adventurous gamble started by the policy of an offensive at the front and the series of breaches of the front, which deprived the Provisional Government of all prestige and fired the hopes of the counter-revolutionaries, who launched an attack on the government. There are rumours that a phase of broadly conceived provocations has begun in our country. Delegates from the front are of the opinion that both the offensive and the retreat—in a word, all that has happened at the front—were planned in order to discredit the revolution and overthrow the Soviets. I do not know whether these rumours are true or not, but it is noteworthy that on July 2 the Cadets resigned from the government, on the 3rd the July events began, and on the 4th came the news of the breach of the front. An amazing coincidence! It cannot be said that the Cadets resigned because of the decision regarding the Ukraine, because the Cadets did not object to the decision on the Ukrainian question. There is another fact which indicates that

a phase of provocation has really begun—I am referring to the shooting affray in the Ukraine.[58] In the light of these facts it should be clear to the comrades that the breach of the front was one of the factors in the plan of the counter-revolutionaries which were to discredit the idea of revolution in the eyes of the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie.

There is a third factor which has helped to strengthen the counter-revolutionary forces in Russia—Allied capital. If, when it saw that tsarism was working for a separate peace, Allied capital betrayed Nicholas' government, there is nothing to prevent it breaking with the present government should it prove incapable of preserving the "united" front. Milyukov said at one of the sittings that Russia was valued in the international market as a supplier of man-power, and received money for this, and that if it should turn out that the new governmental authority, in the shape of the Provisional Government, was incapable of supporting the united front of attack on Germany, it would not be worth subsidising such a government. And without money, without credits, the government was bound to fall. That is the secret why the Cadets became a big force at the time of the crisis, while Kerensky and all the Ministers were mere puppets in the hands of the Cadets. The strength of the Cadets lay in the fact that they were supported by Allied capital.

Russia was faced with two courses:

Either the war was to be ended, all financial ties with imperialism severed, the revolution advanced, the foundations of the bourgeois world shaken, and an era of workers' revolution begun;

Or the other course, that of continuing the war, continuing the offensive at the front, obeying every command of Allied capital and the Cadets—and then complete dependence on Allied capital (there were definite rumours in the Taurida Palace that America would give 8,000 million rubles for the "rehabilitation" of the economy) and the triumph of counter-revolution.

There was no third course.

The attempt of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to make out that the demonstration of July 3 and 4 was an armed revolt is simply absurd. On July 3 we proposed a united revolutionary front against counter-revolution. Our slogan was "All power to the Soviets!" and, hence, a united revolutionary front. But the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries feared to break with the bourgeoisie, turned their backs on us, and thereby broke the revolutionary front in deference to the counter-revolutionaries. If those responsible for the victory of the counter-revolution are to be named, it was the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. It is our misfortune that Russia is a country of petty bourgeois, and that it still follows the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who are compromising with the Cadets. And until the masses become disillusioned with the idea of compromise with the bourgeoisie, the revolution will go haltingly and limpingly.

The picture we have now is a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the counter-revolutionary generals. The government, while ostensibly combating this dictatorship, is actually carrying out its will, and is

only a shield protecting it from the wrath of the people. The policy of endless concessions pursued by the weakened and discredited Soviets only supplements the picture, and if the Soviets are not being dispersed, it is because they are "needed" as a "necessary" and very "convenient" screen.

Hence the situation has changed fundamentally.

Our tactics must likewise change.

Formerly we stood for the peaceful transfer of power to the Soviets, and we assumed that it would be sufficient for the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets to decide to take power, and the bourgeoisie would peacefully clear out of the way. And, indeed, in March, April and May every decision of the Soviets was regarded as law, because it could always be backed by force. With the disarmament of the Soviets and their (virtual) degradation to the level of mere "trade union" organisations, the situation has changed. Now the decisions of the Soviets are disregarded. To take power now, it is first necessary to overthrow the existing dictatorship.

Overthrow of the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie—that is what the immediate slogan of the Party must be.

The peaceful period of the revolution has ended. A period of clashes and explosions has begun.

The slogan of overthrowing the present dictatorship can be realised only if there is a powerful new political upsurge on a country-wide scale. Such an upsurge is inevitable; it is dictated by the country's whole trend of development, by the fact that not a single one of the basic issues of the revolution has been decided, for the

questions of the land, workers' control, peace and governmental power have remained unsettled.

Repressive measures only aggravate the situation without settling a single issue of the revolution.

The main forces of the new movement will be the urban proletariat and the poorer strata of the peasantry. It is they that will take power in the event of victory.

The characteristic feature of the moment is that the counter-revolutionary measures are being implemented through the agency of "Socialists." It is only because it has created such a screen that the counter-revolution may continue to exist for another month or two. But since the forces of revolution are developing, explosions are bound to occur, and the moment will come when the workers will raise and rally around them the poorer strata of the peasantry, will raise the standard of workers' revolution and usher in an era of socialist revolution in Europe.

4. REPLIES TO QUESTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION

July 31

First question: "What forms of militant organisation does the speaker propose in place of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies?" My reply is that the question is not put properly. I did not oppose the Soviets as a form of organisation of the working class. The slogan is determined not by the form of organisation of the revolutionary institution, but by its content, its flesh and

blood. If the Cadets had entered the Soviets, we should never have raised the slogan of transferring power to them.

We are now advancing the demand for the transfer of power to the proletariat and poor peasantry. Consequently, it is a question not of form, but of the *class* to which power is to be transferred; it is a question of the composition of the Soviets.

The Soviets are the most appropriate form of organisation of the working-class struggle for power; but the Soviets are not the only type of revolutionary organisation. It is a purely Russian form. Abroad, we have seen this role played by the municipalities during the Great French Revolution, and by the Central Committee of the National Guard during the Paris Commune. And even here in Russia the idea of a Revolutionary Committee was mooted. Perhaps the Workers' Section will be the form best adapted for the struggle for power.

But it must be clearly realised that it is not the form of organisation that is decisive.

What really is decisive is whether the working class is mature enough for dictatorship; everything else will come of itself, will be brought about by the creative action of the revolution.

On questions two and three—what, practically, is our attitude towards the existing Soviets?—the reply is quite clear. If the point at issue is the transfer of all power to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, this slogan is obsolete. And that is the only point at issue. The idea of overthrowing the Soviets is an invention. Nobody here has suggested it. The fact that we

are proposing to withdraw the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" does not, however, mean "Down with the Soviets!" And although we are withdrawing the slogan, we are not even resigning from the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, in spite of the wretched role it has lately been playing.

The local Soviets have still a role to play, for they will have to defend themselves against the attacks of the Provisional Government, and in this fight we shall support them.

And so, I repeat, the withdrawal of the demand for the transfer of power to the Soviets does not mean "Down with the Soviets!" "Our attitude towards those Soviets in which we have the majority" is one of the greatest sympathy. May they live and flourish. But the *might* is no longer with the Soviets. Formerly, the Provisional Government would issue a decree and the Executive Committee of the Soviets would issue a counter-decree, and it was only the latter that acquired force of law. Recall the case of Order No. 1.[59] Now, however, the Provisional Government ignores the Central Executive Committee. The decision that the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets would take part in the commission of inquiry into the events of July 3-5 was not cancelled by the Central Executive Committee; it was by order of Kerensky that no effect was given to it. The question now is not one of winning a majority in the Soviets—which in itself is very important—but of overthrowing the counter-revolutionary dictatorship.

To question four—asking for a more concrete definition of the concept the "poor peasantry" and an indication of its form of organisation—my reply is that the

term "poor peasantry" is not a new one. It was introduced into Marxist literature by Comrade Lenin in 1905, and since then it has been used in nearly every issue of *Pravda* and found a place in the resolutions of the April Conference.

The poorer strata of the peasantry are those which are at odds with the upper sections of the peasantry. The Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, which allegedly "represents" 80 million peasants (counting women), is an organisation of the upper sections of the peasantry. The lower sections of the peasantry are waging a fierce struggle against the policy of this Soviet. Whereas the head of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, Chernov, as well as Avksentyev and others, are urging the peasants not to seize the land immediately, but to wait for a general settlement of the land question by the Constituent Assembly, the peasants retort by seizing the land and ploughing it, seizing farm implements and so on. We have information to this effect from the Penza, Voronezh, Vitebsk, Kazan and a number of other gubernias. This fact alone clearly indicates that the rural population is divided into lower and upper sections, that the peasantry no longer exists as an integral whole. The upper sections mainly follow the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The lower sections cannot live without land, and they are in opposition to the Provisional Government. These are the peasants who have little land, only one horse or no horse at all, etc. Associated with them are the sections which have practically no land, the semi-proletarians.

It would be unwise in a revolutionary period not to attempt to reach some agreement with these sections of

the peasantry. However, the farm-labourer sections of the peasantry should be organised separately and rallied around the proletarians.

What form the organisation of these sections will take is difficult to predict. At present the lower sections of the peasantry are either organising unauthorised Soviets, or are trying to capture the existing Soviets. Thus, in Petrograd, about six weeks ago, a Soviet of poor peasants was formed (composed of representatives from eighty military units and from factories), which is waging a fierce struggle against the policy of the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies.

In general, Soviets are the most appropriate form of organisation of the masses. We should not, however, speak in terms of *institutions*, but should indicate their *class content*; and we should strive to get the masses too to distinguish between *form* and *content*.

Generally speaking, the form of organisation is not the basic question. If the revolution advances, the organisational forms will be forthcoming. We must not let the question of form obscure the basic question: to *which class* must power pass?

Henceforth a bloc with the defencists is unthinkable. The defencist parties have bound up their fate with the bourgeoisie, and the idea of a bloc extending from the Socialist-Revolutionaries to the Bolsheviks has suffered fiasco. The question now is to fight the top sections of the Soviets, to fight them in alliance with the poorer strata of the peasantry and to sweep away the counter-revolution.

5. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION

July 31

Comrades, first of all I must make a few corrections of fact.

Comrade Yaroslavsky objects to my assertion that the Russian proletariat is the most organised, and points to the Austrian proletariat. But, comrades, I was speaking of "red," revolutionary organisation, and in no other country is the proletariat organised in this way to the same extent as the Russian proletariat.

Angarsky is quite wrong when he says that I advocate the idea of uniting all forces. But we cannot help seeing that, for different motives, not only the peasantry and the proletariat but also the Russian bourgeoisie and foreign capital turned their backs on tsarism. That is a fact. And it would be a bad thing if Marxists refused to face facts. But later the first two forces took the path of developing the revolution further, and the other two the path of counter-revolution.

I shall now pass to the substance of the matter. Bukharin put it most trenchantly but he, too, failed to carry it to its logical conclusion. Bukharin asserts that the imperialist bourgeois have formed a bloc with the muzhiks. But with which muzhiks? We have different kinds of muzhiks. The bloc has been formed with the Right-wing muzhiks; but we have lower, Left-wing muzhiks, who represent the poorer strata of the peasantry. Now with these the bloc could not have been formed. These have not formed a bloc with the big bourgeoisie; they follow it because they are po-

litically undeveloped, they are simply being deceived, led by the nose.

Against whom is the bloc directed?

Bukharin did not say. It is a bloc of Allied and Russian capital, the army officers and the upper sections of the peasantry, represented by Socialist-Revolutionaries of the Chernov type. This bloc has been formed against the lower peasantry and against the workers.

What is the prospect Bukharin held out? His analysis is fundamentally wrong. In his opinion, in the first stage we are moving towards a peasant revolution. But it is bound to concur, to coincide with a workers' revolution. It cannot be that the working class, which constitutes the vanguard of the revolution, will not at the same time fight for its own demands. I therefore consider that Bukharin's scheme has not been properly thought out.

The second stage, according to Bukharin, will be a proletarian revolution supported by Western Europe, without the peasants, who will have received land and will be satisfied. But against whom would this revolution be directed? Bukharin's gimcrack scheme furnishes no reply to this question. No other approach to an analysis of events has been proposed.

About the political situation. There is no longer any talk of dual power. Formerly the Soviets represented a real force; now they are merely organs for uniting the masses, and possess no power. That is precisely why it is impossible "simply" to transfer power to them. Comrade Lenin, in his pamphlet,[60] goes further and definitely says that there is no dual power, because the

whole power has passed into the hands of the capitalists, and to advance the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" now would be quixotic.

Whereas formerly no laws were of any validity without the sanction of the Executive Committee of the Soviets, now there is not even talk of dual power. Capture all the Soviets, and even so you will have no power!

We jeered at the Cadets during the district Duma elections because they represented a miserable group which obtained only 20 per cent of the votes. Now they are jeering at us. Why? Because, with the connivance of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, power has passed into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Comrades are in a hurry to settle the question of how to organise the governmental power. But power is not yet in your hands!

The chief task is propaganda about the necessity of *overthrowing* the existing power. We are still inadequately prepared for this. But we must prepare for it.

The workers, peasants and soldiers must be made to realise that unless the present power is overthrown they will secure neither freedom nor land!

And so, the question is not how to organise the governmental power, but to overthrow it. Once we have seized power we shall know how to organise it.

Now a few words in reply to Angarsky's and Nogin's objections on the subject of socialist changes in Russia. Already at the April Conference we said that the moment had come to begin to take steps towards socialism. (*Reads the end of the resolution of the April Conference "On the Current Situation."*)

"The proletariat of Russia, operating in one of the most backward countries of Europe, in the midst of a small-peasant population,cannot set itself the aim of introducing socialist changes immediately. But it would be a great mistake, and in practice even complete desertion to the bourgeoisie, to deduce from this that the working class must support the bourgeoisie, or that we must confine our activities within limits acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that we must reject the leading role of the proletariat in the work of explaining to the people the urgency of a series of steps towards socialism which are now practically ripe."

The comrades are three months behind the times. And what has happened in these three months? The petty bourgeoisie has split into sections, the lower sections are parting ways with the upper sections, the proletariat is organising, and economic disruption is spreading, rendering still more urgent the introduction of workers' control (for instance, in Petrograd, the Donets region, etc.). All this goes to corroborate the theses already adopted in April. But the comrades would drag us back.

About the Soviets. The fact that we are withdrawing the old slogan about power to the Soviets does not mean that we are opposing the Soviets. On the contrary, we can and must work in the Soviets, even in the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, that organ of counter-revolutionary camouflage. The Soviets, it is true, are now merely organs for uniting the masses, but we are always with the masses, and we shall not leave the Soviets unless we are driven out. Do we not remain in the factory committees and the municipalities even though they have no power? But while we remain in the Soviets we continue to expose the tactics of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

Now that the counter-revolution has patently revealed the connection between our bourgeoisie and Allied capital, it has become more obvious than ever that in our revolutionary struggle we must rely upon three factors: the Russian proletariat, our peasantry, and the international proletariat—for the fate of our revolution is closely bound up with the West-European movement.

6. REPLY TO PREOBRAZHENSKY ON CLAUSE 9 OF THE RESOLUTION "ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION"

August 3

Stalin reads clause 9 of the resolution:

9. "The task of these revolutionary classes will then be to bend every effort to take the state power into their hands and, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat of the advanced countries, direct it towards peace and towards the socialist reconstruction of society."

Preobrazhensky: I propose a different formulation of the end of the resolution: "to direct it towards peace and, in the event of a proletarian revolution in the West, towards socialism." If we adopt the formulation proposed by the commission it will contradict Bukharin's resolution which we have already adopted.

Stalin: I am against such an amendment. The possibility is not excluded that Russia will be the country that will lay the road to socialism. No country hitherto has enjoyed such freedom in time of war as Russia does, or has attempted to introduce workers' control of production. Moreover, the base of our revolution is broader

than in Western Europe, where the proletariat stands utterly alone face to face with the bourgeoisie. In our country the workers are supported by the poorer strata of the peasantry. Lastly, in Germany the state apparatus is incomparably more efficient than the imperfect apparatus of our bourgeoisie, which is itself a tributary to European capital. We must discard the antiquated idea that only Europe can show us the way. There is dogmatic Marxism and creative Marxism. I stand by the latter.

Chairman: I shall put Preobrazhensky's amendment to the vote. Rejected.*

First published in
Minutes of the Sixth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks),
Communist Publishing House, 1919

* In view of the brevity and obvious inadequacy of the *Minutes of the Sixth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)*, which, moreover, were published two years after the congress, the editors considered it necessary in re-establishing the text of Comrade Stalin's speeches at the Sixth Congress to consult, in addition to the *Minutes*, the official records of the speeches printed in July and August 1917 in the newspapers: *Rabochy i Soldat*, Nos. 7 and 14, and *Proletary*, No. 3.

WHAT DO THE CAPITALISTS WANT?

The Second All-Russian Congress of Merchants and Manufacturers opened in Moscow the other day. It was inaugurated with a programmatic speech by the leader of the nationalists, Ryabushinsky the millionaire.

What did Ryabushinsky say?

What is the capitalists' programme?

The workers need to know, especially now that the capitalists command the government, and the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are flirting with them as "virile forces."

For the capitalists are the sworn enemies of the workers, and in order to vanquish our enemies we must first know who they are.

What, then, do the capitalists want?

* * *

Who Wields the Power?

The capitalists are not empty chatterers. They are men of action. They know that the fundamental issue of revolution and counter-revolution is the question of power. It is not surprising, therefore, that Ryabushinsky began his speech with this fundamental question.

"Our Provisional Government," he said, "which represented only a semblance of power, was under the pressure of outsiders. Actually a gang of political charlatans had enthroned themselves in power. The Soviet pseudo-leaders of the people were leading them to disaster, and the whole realm of Russia was on the brink of a yawning abyss" (*Rech*).

That "actually a gang of political charlatans had enthroned themselves in power" is, of course, true. But it is no less true that these "charlatans" must be sought for not among the "Soviet leaders," but among the Ryabushinskys themselves, among those friends of Ryabushinsky who on July 2 resigned from the Provisional Government, bargained for weeks over Ministerial portfolios, blackmailed the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik simpletons by threatening to deprive the government of credits, and finally achieved their object and compelled them to dance to their tune.

For it is these "charlatans," and not the "Soviet leaders," who dictated to the government the arrests and raids, the shootings and the death penalty.

It is these "charlatans" who are "exerting pressure" on the government and transforming it into a shield to protect them from the wrath of the people.

It is these "charlatans," and not the "Soviet leaders," devoid of power, who "actually have enthroned themselves in power" in Russia.

But that, of course, is not the point at issue. The point at issue is that the Soviets, before which only yesterday the capitalists were cringing, and which are now defeated, still retain a fragment of power, and now the capitalists want to deprive them of this last shred in order the more securely to establish their own power.

That is what Mr. Ryabushinsky has in mind first of all.

Do you want to know what the capitalists want? *All power to the capitalists*—that is what they want.

* * *

Who Is Bringing Disaster on Russia?

Ryabushinsky spoke not only of the present. He is not averse to "casting a glance back on the preceding months." And what does he find? "Summing up the situation," he discovers, among other things, that "we have reached a sort of impasse from which we cannot extricate ourselves. . . . The food problem has become utterly unmanageable, Russia's economic and financial affairs are thoroughly dislocated, etc."

And those responsible for this, it appears, are these same "comrades" of the Soviets, these "squanderers" who ought to be "put under guardianship."

"The land of Russia will groan in their comradely embrace so long as the people do not see through them; and when they do see through them they will say: 'You are deceivers of the people!'"

That Russia has been driven into an impasse, that she is in a state of profound crisis, that she is on the brink of disaster, is, of course, true.

But is it not strange:

1) That whereas before the war there was a superfluity of grain in Russia and every year we exported

400-500 million poods, now, during the war, there is a shortage of grain and we are compelled to starve?

2) That whereas before the war Russia's national debt amounted to 9,000 million rubles, and to pay the interest on it only 400 million rubles were required annually, during the three years of the war the national debt has risen to 60,000 million rubles, requiring 3,000 million rubles annually for the payment of interest alone?

Is it not clear that Russia has been driven into an impasse by the war, and only by the war?

But who impelled Russia into the war, and who is impelling her to continue the war, if not these selfsame Ryabushinskys and Konovalovs, Milyukovs and Vinavers?

There are "squanderers" in plenty in Russia, and they are bringing disaster upon her—of that there can be no doubt. But they must be sought for not among the "comrades," but among the Ryabushinskys and Konovalovs, the capitalists and bankers, who are making millions out of war contracts and government loans.

And when, some day, the Russian people see through them, they will make short work of them—of that they may rest assured.

But that, of course, is not the point at issue. The point at issue is that the capitalists are thirsting for their profitable "war to a finish," but are afraid to answer for its consequences, and so they are trying to throw the blame on the "comrades," in order to be able the more easily to drown the revolution in the welter of war.

That is what Mr. Ryabushinsky's speech hinted at.

Do you want to know what the capitalists want?

War until complete victory over the revolution—that is what they want.

* * *

Who Is Betraying Russia?

After describing the critical state of Russia, Ryabushinsky proposed a "way out of the situation." And listen to the "way out" he proposes:

"The government has not given the people bread, or coal, or textiles. . . . Perhaps to find a way out of the situation we shall need the gaunt hand of famine, the destitution of the people, which would seize by the throat the false friends of the people—the democratic Soviets and Committees."

Do you hear that? "*We shall need* the gaunt hand of famine, the destitution of the people." . . .

The Ryabushinskys, it appears, are not averse to bestowing "famine" and "destitution" upon Russia in order to "seize by the throat" the "democratic Soviets and Committees."

They are not averse, it appears, to closing down mills and factories or creating unemployment and starvation, in order to provoke the people to give premature battle and the more thoroughly to settle accounts with the workers and peasants.

There you have them, these "virile forces" of the country, on the testimony of *Rabochaya Gazeta* and *Delo Naroda*!

There you have them, the real traitors and betrayers of Russia!

Many are talking about treachery in Russia today. Former gendarmes and present secret service agents, incompetent hirelings and dissolute souteneurs are all writing about treachery, hinting at the "democratic Soviets and Committees." Let the workers know that the lying talk about treachery is only a camouflage to conceal the real betrayers of much-suffering Russia!

Do you want to know what the capitalists want?

The triumph of the interests of their purses, even if it means the doom of Russia—that is what they want.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 13,
August 6, 1917
Editorial

AGAINST THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE[61]

The counter-revolution is entering a new phase of development. From wrecking and destruction it is passing to the consolidation of the positions it has won. From riots and disorders it is passing into the "legal channel" of "constitutional development."

The revolution can and must be defeated, say the counter-revolutionaries. But that is not enough. Approval must be obtained for this. And it must be so arranged that this approval is given by the "people" themselves, by the "nation," and not only in Petrograd or at the front, but all over Russia. Then the victory will be a firm one. Then the gains achieved may serve as a basis for new victories of the counter-revolution.

But how is this to be done?

One might speed the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the sole representative of the entire Russian people, and ask its approval for the policy of war and ruin, of wrecking and arrests, of manhandling and shootings.

But to this the bourgeoisie will not agree. It knows that from the Constituent Assembly, in which the peasants would be in the majority, it would secure

neither recognition nor approval of a counter-revolutionary policy.

That is why it is striving to secure (has already secured!) the postponement of the Constituent Assembly. And it will probably continue to postpone it in order finally to kill it altogether.

What, then, is the "way out"?

The "way out" lies in substituting for the Constituent Assembly a "Moscow Conference."

The "way out" lies in substituting for the will of the people the will of the upper strata of the bourgeois and landlords, by substituting for the Constituent Assembly a "Moscow Conference."

Convening a conference of merchants and manufacturers, of landlords and bankers, of members of the tsarist Duma and the already tamed Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, in order to proclaim such a conference a "National Assembly" and obtain its approval of the policy of imperialism and counter-revolution, and of laying the burden of the war on the shoulders of the workers and peasants—that is the "way out" for the counter-revolution.

The counter-revolution needs a parliament of its own, a centre of its own, and it is creating it.

The counter-revolution needs the confidence of the "public," and it is creating it.

That is the crux of the matter.

In this respect the counter-revolution is following the same course as the revolution. It is learning from the revolution.

The revolution had its parliament, its real centre, and it felt that it was organised.

Now the counter-revolution is striving to create its own parliament, and it is creating it in the very heart of Russia, in Moscow, by the hand—oh, the irony of fate!—of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

And this at a time when the parliament of the revolution has been degraded to a mere adjunct of the imperialist bourgeois counter-revolution, when war to the death has been declared upon the Soviets and Committees of the workers, peasants and soldiers!

It is not difficult to understand that under these circumstances the conference to be convened in Moscow on August 12 will inevitably be transformed into an organ of counter-revolutionary conspiracy against the workers, who are being threatened with lockouts and unemployment, against the peasants, who are "not being given" land, and against the soldiers, who are being deprived of the liberties they won in the days of the revolution—into an organ of conspiracy camouflaged by the "socialist talk" of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who are supporting the conference.

It is consequently the task of the advanced workers:

1) To tear the mask of an organ of popular representation from the face of the conference, to drag its counter-revolutionary, anti-popular nature into the light of day.

2) To expose the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who are using the "salvation of the revolution" flag to mask the conference and are misleading the people of Russia.

3) To organise mass protest meetings against these counter-revolutionary machinations of the "saviours"—the saviours of the profits of the landlords and capitalists.

Let the enemies of the revolution know that the workers will not allow themselves to be deceived, that they will not allow the battle-standard of revolution to slip from their hands.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 14,
August 8, 1917

Editorial

MORE ON THE SUBJECT OF STOCKHOLM[62]

The war goes on. Its bloodstained chariot is advancing grimly and inexorably. From a European war it is turning step by step into a world war, enmeshing more and more countries in its evil toils.

And with it the significance of the Stockholm Conference is declining and diminishing.

The "fight for peace" and the tactics of "bringing pressure to bear" upon the imperialist governments proclaimed by the conciliators have turned out to be but an "empty sound."

The attempts of the conciliators to speed the termination of the war and to restore the workers' International by means of an agreement between the "defencist majorities" in the various countries have ended in utter fiasco.

The Stockholm scheme of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, around which a close web of imperialist intrigue is being woven, is bound to become either a futile parade or a pawn in the hands of the imperialist governments.

It is now clear to all that the European tour of the delegates of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets[63] and the "socialist" diplomacy of the defencists, with its official

luncheons for representatives of British and French social-imperialism, are not the way to restore the international brotherhood of the workers.

Our Party was right when already at the April Conference it dissociated itself from the Stockholm Conference.

The development of the war and the whole world situation are inevitably aggravating class antagonisms and ushering in an era of great social conflicts.

In this, and in this alone, is the democratic way of ending the war to be sought.

They talk about an "evolution" in the views of the British and French social-patriots, about their decision to go to Stockholm and so on.

But does this really alter anything? Did not the Russian and the German and Austrian social-patriots also decide (and even before the British and French!) to participate in the Stockholm Conference? But who will assert that this decision of theirs has helped to hasten the ending of the war?

Has Scheidemann's party, which has agreed to participate in the Stockholm Conference, ceased to support its government, which is waging an offensive and seizing Galicia and Rumania?

Are not Renaudel's and Henderson's parties, which talk so much about the "fight for peace" and about the Stockholm Conference, at the same time supporting their governments, which are seizing Mesopotamia and Greece?

In the face of these facts, of what value can their *talk* in Stockholm be from the point of view of ending the war?

Who does not know that pious talk of peace, as a camouflage for resolute support of a policy of war and conquest, is one of the old, old imperialist methods of deceiving the masses?

It is said that circumstances have changed compared with what they used to be, and that accordingly we ought to change our attitude towards the Stockholm Conference.

Yes, circumstances have changed, but they have changed not in favour but absolutely against the Stockholm Conference.

The first change is that the European war has turned into a world war, and has extended and deepened the general crisis to an extreme degree.

Consequently, the chances of an imperialist peace and of a policy of "pressure" on the governments have declined to the very minimum.

The second change is that Russia has taken the path of an offensive at the front and has adapted the internal life of the country to the requirements of the offensive policy by putting a curb on liberty. For, surely, it must be understood that that policy is incompatible with "maximum liberty," that the turning point in the development of our revolution was already reached in June. And the Bolsheviks "find themselves sitting in jail," while the defencists, having transformed themselves into offensivists, are playing the part of the jailers.

Consequently, the position of the advocates of a "fight for peace" has become untenable, for whereas before it was possible to talk of peace without fearing to be exposed as a liar, now, after the adoption of the policy of the offensive with the support of the "defencists,"

talk of peace coming from the lips of "defencists" sounds like mockery.

What does all this show?

It shows that "comradely" *talk* about peace at Stockholm and bloody *deeds* at the front have proved to be absolutely incompatible, that the contradiction between them has become glaring, self-evident.

And that makes the failure of the Stockholm Conference inevitable.

In view of this, our attitude towards the Stockholm Conference had also changed somewhat.

Before, we exposed the Stockholm scheme. Now it is hardly worth exposing, because it is exposing itself.

Before, it had to be condemned as playing at peace, which was deceiving the masses. Now it is hardly worth condemning, because one does not hit a man when he is down.

But from this it follows that the road to Stockholm is not the road to peace.

The road to peace lies not through Stockholm but through the revolutionary struggle of the workers against imperialism.

Rabochy i Soldat, No. 15,
August 9, 1917

Editorial

WHITHER THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE?

Flight From Petrograd

The Moscow Conference has opened. It has opened not in the centre of the revolution, not in Petrograd, but far away, in "somnolent Moscow."

In the days of the revolution important conferences were usually convened in Petrograd, the citadel of the revolution which had overthrown tsarism. They were not afraid of Petrograd then, they clung to it. But now the days of revolution have been superseded by the twilight of counter-revolution. Now Petrograd is dangerous, now they fear it like the plague and . . . flee from it like the devil from holy water—far away, to Moscow, "where it is quieter," and where the counter-revolutionaries think it will be easier for them to do their dirty work.

"The conference will take place under the flag of Moscow. Moscow ideas and Moscow sentiments are remote from putrid Petrograd—that plague spot which is contaminating Russia" (*Vecherneye Vremya*, August 11).

So say the counter-revolutionaries.

The "defencists" fully agree with them.

"To Moscow, to Moscow!" whisper the "saviours of the country" as they flee from Petrograd.

"Good riddance," revolutionary Petrograd replies.

"And a boycott on your conference!" the Petrograd workers hurl after them.

And what about Moscow? Will it justify the hopes of the counter-revolutionaries?

It does not look like it. The newspapers are full of reports of a general strike in Moscow. The strike has been declared by the Moscow workers. They, like the Petrograd workers, are boycotting the conference. Moscow is not lagging behind Petrograd.

Long live the Moscow workers!

What's to be done? Flee again?

From Petrograd to Moscow, and from Moscow—whither?

To Tsarevokokshaisk, perhaps?

Things look black, very black for Messieurs the Versaillese. . . .

* * *

From the Conference to a "Long Parliament"[64]

When they were arranging the Moscow Conference Messieurs the "saviours" pretended they were convening an "ordinary conference," which would decide nothing and commit nobody to anything. But little by little the "ordinary conference" became transformed into a "Conference of State," and then into a "Grand Assembly," and now there is definite talk about converting it into a "Long Parliament" which would decide the cardinal questions of our life.

"If the Moscow Conference," says Karaulov, the Ataman of the Terek Cossack troops, "does not crystallise into a centre for uniting the country, Russia's future will be sombre. I think, however, that such a centre will be established . . . and if . . . such a support point eventuates, the Moscow Conference will not only prove a virile body, but will have every chance of a

prolonged and colourful existence, like that of the *'Long Parliament'* in the time of Cromwell. I, for my part, as a representative of the Cossacks, will do all I can to assist the formation of such a uniting centre" (*Russkiye Vedomosti*, evening edition, August 11).

So says a "representative of the Cossacks."

The Moscow Conference as a "centre for uniting" the counter-revolution—such is the brief import of Karaulov's lengthy speech.

The same thing was said by the Don Cossacks in their instructions to their representatives:

"The government must be organised by the Moscow Conference or by the Provisional Committee of the State Duma and not by some party, as has been the case up to now. And that government must be vested with the fullest authority and be allowed complete independence."

So says the Don Cossack assembly.

And who does not know now that "the Cossacks are a force"?

There can be no room for doubt—either the conference is abortive, or it will inevitably be transformed into a "Long Parliament" of the counter-revolution.

Whether they wanted it or not, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have by convening the conference facilitated the work of organising counter-revolution.

Such is the fact.

* * *

Who Are They?

Who are they, the big chiefs of counter-revolution?

First of all the military, the higher army officers, who have the following of certain sections of the Cossacks and of the Knights of St. George.

Secondly, our industrial bourgeoisie, headed by Ryabushinsky, the man who is threatening the people with "famine" and "destitution" if they do not desist from their demands.

Lastly, Milyukov's party, which unites the generals and industrialists against the Russian people, against the revolution.

All that was made sufficiently clear at the "Preliminary Conference"[65] of generals, industrialists and Cadets held from August 8 to 10.

"The name of General Kornilov is on everyone's lips," writes *Birzhovka*. "*The representatives of what is called the military party, headed by General Alexeyev, and the delegates of the Cossack League are the predominant influence at the conference.* The speech General Alexeyev delivered at the first sitting, which was greeted with stormy expressions of approval, will be repeated at the Moscow Conference of State" (*Vechernyaya Birzhovka*, August 11).

That was the speech which Milyukov proposed should be published as a leaflet.

Further:

"General Kaledin is attracting considerable attention. He is looked to and listened to with particular interest. The entire military section is grouping around him" (*Vecherneye Vremya*, August 11).

Lastly, everybody knows about the ultimatums of the Knights of St. George and the Cossack Leagues, headed by these same generals, whether deposed or still undeposed.

And the ultimatums are carried out forthwith. Military men are not fond of "idle chatter."

There is no room for doubt: matters are moving towards the establishment and legalisation of a military dictatorship.

Our native and the Allied bourgeoisie will "merely" provide the money.

It is not for nothing that "Sir George Buchanan is showing interest in the conference" (see *Birzhovka*), and it seems that he, too, is preparing to go to Moscow.

It is not for nothing that Mr. Milyukov's ruffians are jubilant.

It is not for nothing that Ryabushinsky regards himself as a Minin, a "saviour," etc.

* * *

What Do They Want?

They want the complete triumph of the counter-revolution. Listen to the resolution adopted by the preliminary conference.

"Let discipline be restored in the army, and power will pass to the officers."

In other words: Curb the soldiers!

"Let a united and strong central government put an end to the system of irresponsible rule of collegiate institutions."

In other words: Down with the Workers' and Peasants' Soviets!

Let the government "resolutely do away with all traces of dependence upon any committees, Soviets and similar organisations whatsoever."

In other words: Let the government depend only upon Cossack "Soviets" and Knights of St. George "conferrers."

The resolution asserts that only in this way can "Russia be saved."

Clear, it would seem.

Well, Messieurs the compromising Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, are you willing to arrange a compromise with the representatives of the "virile forces"?

Or perhaps you have thought better of it?

Unhappy compromisers. . . .

* * *

The Voice of Moscow

But Moscow is doing its revolutionary work. The newspapers report that in response to an appeal of the Bolsheviks a general strike has already begun in Moscow in spite of the decision of the All-Russian Executive Committee, which is still trailing in the wake of the enemies of the people.

Shame on the Executive Committee!

Long live the revolutionary proletariat of Moscow!

Let the voice of our Moscow comrades ring out loudly, to the joy of the oppressed and enslaved!

Let the whole of Russia know that there are still people who are prepared to give their lives in defence of the revolution.

Moscow is on strike. Long live Moscow!

Proletary, No. 1,
August 13, 1917

Editorial

COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA

At the time of the revolution and democratic change the keynote of the movement was emancipation.

The peasants were emancipating themselves from the omnipotence of the landlords. The workers were emancipating themselves from the caprice of the factory managements. The soldiers were emancipating themselves from the tyranny of the generals. . . .

The process of emancipation could not but extend to the peoples of Russia who for ages had been oppressed by tsarism.

The decree on the "equality" of the peoples and the actual abolition of national disabilities, the congresses of Ukrainians, Finns and Byelorussians and the raising of the question of a federal republic, the solemn proclamation of the right of nations to self-determination and the official promises "not to create obstacles"—all these were evidences of the great movement for emancipation of the peoples of Russia.

That was in the days of the revolution, when the landlords had departed from the scene and the imperial-

ist bourgeoisie was forced to the wall by the onslaught of the democracy.

With the return to power of the landlords (generals!) and the triumph of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, the picture has completely changed.

The "grand words" about self-determination and the solemn promises "not to create obstacles" are being consigned to oblivion. Obstacles of the most incredible kind are being created, even to the extent of direct interference in the internal affairs of the peoples. The Finnish Diet[66] has been dissolved, with the threat of "declaring a state of siege in Finland, should the need arise" (*Vecherneye Vremya*, August 9). A campaign is being launched against the Ukrainian Rada and Secretariat,[67] with the manifest intention of beheading the autonomy of the Ukraine. Together with this we have a recrudescence of the old, contemptible methods of provoking national clashes and criminal suspicions of "treason," with the object of unleashing the counter-revolutionary chauvinistic forces, drowning in blood the very idea of national emancipation, digging gulfs between the peoples of Russia and sowing enmity among them, to the glee of the enemies of the revolution.

Thereby a mortal blow is being struck at the cause of welding these peoples into a united and brotherly family.

For it is self-evident that the policy of national "pinpricks" does not unite, but divides the peoples by fostering "separatist" tendencies among them.

For it is self-evident that the policy of national oppression pursued by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie

holds out the menace of that very "disintegration" of Russia against which the bourgeois press is so falsely and hypocritically howling.

For it is self-evident that the policy of inciting the nationalities against one another is that same contemptible policy which, by fomenting mutual distrust and enmity among the peoples, splits the forces of the all-Russian proletariat and undermines the very foundations of the revolution.

That is why all our sympathies are with the subject and oppressed peoples in their natural struggle against this policy.

That is why we turn our weapons against those who, under the guise of the right of nations to "self-determination," are pursuing a policy of imperialist annexations and forcible "union."

We are by no means opposed to uniting nations to form a single integral state. We are by no means in favour of the division of big states into small states. For it is self-evident that the union of small states into big states is one of the conditions facilitating the establishment of socialism.

But we absolutely insist that union must be *voluntary*, for only such union is genuine and lasting.

But that requires, in the first place, full and unqualified recognition of the right of the peoples of Russia to self-determination, including the right to secede from Russia.

It requires, further, that this verbal recognition should be backed by deeds, that the peoples should be permitted right away to determine their territories and

the forms of their political structure in their constituent assemblies.

Only such a policy can promote confidence and friendship among the peoples.

Only such a policy can pave the way to a genuine union of the peoples.

Without a doubt, the peoples of Russia are not infallible and may well commit errors when arranging their lives. It is the duty of the Russian Marxists to point out these errors to them, and to their proletarians in the first place, and to endeavour to secure correction of the errors by criticism and persuasion. But *nobody* has the right *forcibly* to interfere in the internal life of nations and to "correct" their errors *by force*. Nations are sovereign in their internal affairs and have the right to arrange their lives as they wish.

Such are the fundamental demands of the peoples of Russia proclaimed by the revolution and now trampled upon by the counter-revolution.

These demands cannot be realised so long as the counter-revolutionaries are in power.

Victory of the revolution is the only way of emancipating the peoples of Russia from national oppression.

There can be only one conclusion, namely, that the problem of emancipation from national oppression is a problem of power. National oppression is rooted in the rule of the landlords and the imperialist bourgeoisie. The way to secure the complete emancipation of the peoples of Russia from national oppression is to transfer power to the proletariat and the revolutionary peasants.

Either the peoples of Russia support the workers' revolutionary struggle for power, and then they will secure their emancipation; or they do not support it, and then they will no more see their emancipation than the back of their heads.

Proletary, No. 1,
August 13, 1917

Unsigned

TWO COURSES

The fundamental issue in the present situation is the war. The economic disruption and the food problem, the question of the land and political liberty are all component parts of the one general problem of the war.

What is the cause of the disruption of the food supply?

The prolonged war, which has disorganised transport and left the towns without bread.

What is the cause of the financial and economic disruption?

The unending war, which is draining Russia's energies and resources.

What is the cause of the repressive measures at the front and in the rear?

The war and the policy of the offensive, which demands "iron discipline."

What is the cause of the triumph of the bourgeois counter-revolution?

The whole course of the war, which demands ever new thousands of millions, while our native bourgeoisie, supported by the Allied bourgeoisie, refuses to grant credits unless the principal gains of the revolution are annulled.

And so on, and so forth.

In view of this, the way to settle all the various "crises" which are now strangling the country is to settle the question of the war.

But how is this to be done?

Two courses lie before Russia.

Either continuation of the war and a further "offensive" at the front, in which case power must inevitably be transferred to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, in order that money may be obtained by internal and foreign loans.

"Saving" the country in that case would mean defraying the cost of the war at the expense of the workers and peasants (indirect taxes!) to suit the Russian and Allied imperialist sharks.

Or transfer of power to the workers and peasants, declaration of democratic terms of peace and cessation of the war, in order to advance the revolution further by transferring the land to the peasants, establishing workers' control over industry and restoring the collapsing national economy at the expense of the profits of the capitalists and landlords.

Saving the country in this case would mean delivering the workers and peasants from the financial burden of the war at the expense of the imperialist sharks.

The first course would lead to the dictatorship of the landlords and capitalists over the toilers, to the imposition of crushing taxation on the country, to the gradual bartering away of Russia to foreign capitalists (concessions!), and to the conversion of Russia into a colony of Britain, America and France.

The second course would usher in an era of workers' revolutions in the West, snap the financial ties that bind Russia, shake the very foundations of bourgeois rule and pave the way for the real emancipation of Russia.

These are the two courses. They reflect the interests of two opposite classes—the imperialist bourgeoisie and the socialist proletariat.

There is no third course.

To reconcile these two courses is as impossible as it is to reconcile imperialism and socialism.

The course of compromise (coalition) with the bourgeoisie is doomed to inevitable failure.

"*Coalition* on the basis of a democratic platform—such is the solution," write the defencist gentry in connection with the Moscow Conference (*Izvestia*[68]).

Not true, Messieurs the compromisers!

Three times have you arranged coalitions with the bourgeoisie, and each time you have landed in a new "crisis of power."

Why?

Because coalition with the bourgeoisie is a false course, one that would cover up the evils of the present situation.

Because coalition is either an empty word, or else a means by which the imperialist bourgeoisie can strengthen its power with the helping hand of the "Socialists."

Did not the present coalition government, which tried to seat itself between the two camps, eventually go over to the side of imperialism?

Why has the "Moscow Conference" been convened, if not to consolidate the position of the counter-revolu-

tionaries and receive sanction (and credits!) for this step from the "men of the land"?

What does Kerensky's speech at the "conference" appealing for "sacrifice" and "class self-denial" in the interests, of course, of the "country" and the "war" amount to, if not to an appeal for the consolidation of imperialism?

And what about Prokopovich's statement that the government "will not tolerate interference of the workers (workers' control!) in the management of the factories"?

What about the statement by the same Minister that "the government will not introduce any radical reforms in the sphere of the land question"?

What about Nekrasov's statement that "the government will not consent to confiscation of private property"?

What is all this, if not directly serving the cause of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

Is it not obvious that coalition is only a mask suitable and profitable to the Milyukovs and Ryabushinskys?

Is it not obvious that the policy of compromise and manoeuvring between the classes is a policy of deceiving and fooling the masses?

No, Messieurs the compromisers, the time has come when there can be no place for vacillation and compromise. There is already definite talk in Moscow of a counter-revolutionary "conspiracy." The bourgeois press is resorting to the tried and tested method of intimidation by spreading rumours about the "surrender of Riga."[69] At such a moment you have to choose:

Either with the proletariat, or against it.

By boycotting the "conference," the Petrograd and Moscow proletarians are urging the course that will *really* save the revolution.

Heed their voice, or get out of the way!

Proletary, No. 2,
August 15, 1917

Editorial

OUTCOME OF THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

The Moscow Conference is over.

Now, after the "sharp clash between the two opposite camps," after the "bloody battle" between the Milyukovs and Tseretelis, now that the "engagement" has ended and the wounded have been brought in, it is permissible to ask: How did the "battle" of Moscow end? Who won and who lost?

The Cadets are rubbing their hands with satisfaction. "The Party of Popular Freedom," they say, "can pride itself on the fact that its slogans . . . have been recognised . . . as the national slogans" (*Rech*).

The defencists are also pleased, for they talk of "the triumph of the democracy" (read: the defencists!), and assert that "the democracy emerges from the Moscow Conference strengthened" (*Izvestia*).

"Bolshevism must be destroyed," said Milyukov at the conference amid the loud applause of the representatives of the "virile forces."

That is what we are doing, replied Tsereteli, for "we have already passed an emergency law" against Bolshevism. Moreover, "the revolution (read: counter-revolution!) is not yet experienced in the struggle against the Left danger." Give us time to acquire experience.

And the Cadets agree that it is better to destroy Bolshevism gradually than at one stroke, and not directly,

not by their own hand, but by the hand of others, the hand of these same "socialist" defencists.

"The Committees and Soviets must be abolished," said General Kaledin amid the applause of the representatives of the "virile forces."

True, replied Tsereteli, but it is too early yet, for "this scaffolding must not be removed before the edifice of the free revolution (read: counter-revolution!) is completed." Give us time to "complete" it, and the Soviets and Committees will be removed!

And the Cadets agree that it is better to degrade the Committees and Soviets to the role of simple adjuncts of the imperialist machine than to destroy them out of hand.

The result is "universal jubilation" and "satisfaction."

It is not for nothing that the newspapers say that there is now "greater unity between the socialist Ministers and Cadet Ministers than before the conference" (*Novaya Zhizn*).

Who has won, you ask?

The capitalists have won, for at the conference the government pledged itself "not to tolerate interference of the workers (control!) in the management of the factories."

The landlords have won, for at the conference the government pledged itself "not to introduce any radical reforms in the sphere of the land question."

The counter-revolutionary generals have won, for the Moscow Conference approved the death penalty.

Who has won, you ask?

The counter-revolution has won, for it has organised

itself on a country-wide scale and rallied the support of all the "virile forces" of the country, such as Ryabushinsky and Milyukov, Tsereteli and Dan, Alexeyev and Kaledin.

The counter-revolution has won, for the so-called "revolutionary democracy" has been placed at its disposal as a convenient shield against the anger of the people.

The counter-revolutionaries are now not alone. The whole "revolutionary democracy" is working for them. Now they have at their disposal the "public opinion" of the "land of Russia," which the defencist gentry will "assiduously" mould.

Coronation of counter-revolution—that is the outcome of the Moscow Conference.

The defencists, who are now prating about the "triumph of the democracy," do not even suspect that they have simply been hired as flunkeys of the triumphant counter-revolutionaries.

That, and that alone, is the political implication of the "honest coalition" which Mr. Tsereteli urged "imploringly" and to which Milyukov and his friends have no objection.

A "coalition" of the defencists and the "virile forces" of the imperialist bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat and the poor peasants—that is the upshot of the Moscow Conference.

Whether this counter-revolutionary "coalition" will suffice the defencists for long, the near future will show.

Proletary, No. 4,
August 17, 1917

Editorial

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR DEFEAT AT THE FRONT

We print below excerpts from two articles of a documentary nature on the causes of the July defeat of our armies at the front.

Both articles, the one by Arseny Merich (in *Delo Naroda*) and the other by V.Borisov (in *Novoye Vremya*[70]), attempt an impartial study of the July defeat, discounting the cheap accusations levelled by despicable people against the Bolsheviks.

The more valuable, therefore, are their admissions and statements.

A. Merich deals mainly with *those responsible* for the defeat. The culprits, it appears, are "former policemen and gendarmes," and, above all, "certain automobiles," of unspecified ownership, which toured the army defending Tarnopol and Czernowitz and ordered the soldiers to retreat. What these automobiles were, and how the commanders could have permitted this manifest hoax, the author, unfortunately, does not say. But he does say distinctly and definitely that it was a "*provoked retreat,*" that it was "*treachery perpetrated in accordance with a deliberate and premeditated plan,*" and that an inquiry is on foot and soon the "secret will come to light."

But what about the Bolsheviks? What about the "Bolshevik treachery"?

Of this there is not a line, not a word in A. Merich's article!

Even more interesting is V. Borisov's article in *Novoye Vremya*. He deals not so much with the culprits as with the *causes* of the defeat.

He bluntly declares that he *"acquits Bolshevism of the baseless charge of being responsible for our defeat,"* that it was due not to Bolshevism, but to "profounder causes," which need to be elucidated and eliminated. And what are these causes? First, the fact that offensive tactics are unsuitable for us because of the "rawness of our generals," the poor "equipment" of our armies, the unorganised state of the troops. Then, the interference of "dilettante" (inexperienced) elements, who insisted on an offensive and succeeded in June in getting their way. Finally, the overreadiness of the government to accept the advice of the Allies on the necessity of an offensive, without taking the actual situation at the front into consideration.

In short, "our" general unpreparedness for the offensive, which made it a costly gamble.

In fact, all that the Bolsheviks and *Pravda* repeatedly warned against, and for which they were slandered by everyone who cared to, is corroborated.

That is what is being said now by people who only yesterday were accusing us of being responsible for the defeat at the front.

We are by no means inclined to rest content with the strategic and other revelations and arguments of *Novoye Vremya*, which now considers it necessary to

"acquit the Bolsheviks of the baseless charge of being responsible for our defeat."

And we are just as little inclined to regard A. Merich's communications as exhaustive.

But we cannot refrain from remarking that if the Ministerial *Delo Naroda* no longer finds it possible to keep silent about those who are really responsible for the defeat, if even (even!) Suvorin's *Novoye Vremya*, which only yesterday was accusing the Bolsheviks of being responsible for the defeat, now considers it necessary to "acquit the Bolsheviks" of this charge, this only shows that murder will out, that the truth about the defeat is too glaring to be hushed up, that the truth about who is responsible for the defeat, now being dragged into the light by the soldiers themselves, is about to lash the faces of the accusers themselves, and that to keep silent any longer would be courting trouble. . . .

Obviously, the accusation of being responsible for the defeat, concocted against the Bolsheviks by enemies of the revolution like the *Novoye Vremya* gentry and supported by "friends" of the revolution like the *Delo Naroda* gentry, *has been utterly discredited.*

That, and that alone, is the reason why these gentlemen have now decided to speak up and say who *really* is responsible for the defeat.

Very much like the wise rats who are the first to leave a sinking ship, are they not?

What conclusions are to be drawn from this?

We are told that an inquiry is being made into the causes of the defeat at the front and we are assured that soon "the secret will come to light." But what guarantee have we that the results of the inquiry will not be

pigeonholed, that it will be conducted objectively, that the culprits will be punished as they deserve?

Our first proposal therefore is: *secure the appointment of representatives of the soldiers themselves to the commission of inquiry.*

This alone can really ensure the exposure of those responsible for the "provoked retreat"!

That is the first conclusion.

We are told about the causes of the defeat and are recommended not to repeat the old "mistakes." But what guarantee have we that the "mistakes" were really mistakes and not a "premeditated plan"? Who can vouch that, after the "provoked" surrender of Tarnopol, the surrender of Riga and Petrograd will not be "provoked" also, with the purpose of undermining the prestige of the revolution and re-erecting the old detested order on its ruins?

Our second proposal therefore is: *establish the control of representatives of the soldiers themselves over the actions of their officers and immediately dismiss all suspects.*

Only such control can ensure the revolution against criminal provocation on a large scale.

That is the second conclusion.

Proletary, No. 5,
August 18, 1917

Unsigned

THE CAUSES OF THE JULY DEFEAT AT THE FRONT

Everyone remembers the malicious allegations and baseless charges levelled against the Bolsheviks of being responsible for the defeat at the front. The bourgeois press and *Delo Naroda*, the provocateurs of *Birzhovka* and *Rabochaya Gazeta*, the former tsarist flunkeys of *Novoye Vremya*, and *Izvestia* all joined in fulminating against the Bolsheviks, whom they blamed for the defeat.

It now transpires that it is not among the Bolsheviks that the *culprits* are to be sought, but among those who sent out the "mysterious automobiles" whose occupants called for retreat and sowed panic among the soldiers (see *Delo Naroda*, August 16).

What "automobiles" they were, and *what the commanders were doing* who permitted these mysterious automobiles to run about loose, *Delo Naroda's* correspondent, unfortunately, does not say.

It now transpires that it is not in Bolshevism that the *reason* for the defeat must be sought, but in "profounder causes," in the fact that offensive tactics are unsuitable for us, in our unpreparedness for an offensive, in the "rawness of our generals" and so on (see *Novoye Vremya*, August 15).

Let the workers and soldiers read and re-read these issues of *Delo Naroda* and *Novoye Vremya*. Let them do so, and they will understand:

1) How right the Bolsheviks were when they warned against an offensive at the front as far back as the end of May (see the *Pravda* issues);

2) How criminal was the behaviour of the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary leaders who agitated for an offensive and at the Congress of Soviets in the early part of June voted down the Bolshevik resolution against an offensive;

3) That the responsibility for the July defeat rests primarily on the Milyukovs and Maklakovs, the Shulgins and Rodzyankos, who, in the name of the State Duma, were already "demanding" an "immediate offensive" at the front in the early part of June.

Here are some excerpts from the articles mentioned:

1) Excerpt from Arseny Merich's communication (*Delo Naroda*, August 16):

"Why? Why did this disaster befall us, almost simultaneously on two sides—at Tarnopol and Czernowitz? Why did the regiments there suddenly lose heart? What happened? What was the cause of this sudden change of mood?

"Officers and soldiers readily give the answer. And their replies coincide almost verbally, each adding some vivid stroke to the ghastly picture. . . .

"The men at the front consider that those chiefly responsible for the panic, for the stampede from the front lines, were the *former policemen and gendarmes.*

"Were they acting concertedly?

"'It is hard to say,' replied an intelligent-looking ensign, formerly a peasant, member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party and of the Executive Committee of the local Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. 'But in every instance it was ascertained

that the panic was sown, that the absurd rumours about the proximity and great strength of the enemy and about the expected release of poison gas within an hour or two were circulated *only by former "narks."* . . . Many of us believe that the former policemen and gendarmes were *not even deliberate traitors, but just "rabbits," cowards.* But the elusive spies and provocateurs have a special instinct for finding loyal henchmen in men like that.' . . .

"Here is how intelligent and observant men describe the circumstances of our army's shameful retreat. . . .

"Companies are marching along a broad road . . . with short intervals between them. . . .

"Suddenly clouds of dust are seen. . . . There is a jam somewhere ahead, nobody knows why. . . . The companies halt, the men huddle together, exchange remarks. . . . Heads are stretched forward to see what is going on ahead, what is concealed in the approaching clouds of dust. . . . Then automobiles are seen, speeding full tilt and sounding their horns. They are now quite close, and shouts are heard: 'Back . . . back . . . the Austrians!' One cannot make out who is shouting, who is in the cars—they rush past so quickly. Sometimes one does catch a glimpse of a tunic, or epaulettes of some sort, but mostly one can distinguish nothing at all. . . . And then it starts. Nobody has any idea where the Austrians are, who is uttering the warning, but the stampede begins. . . . Before the men can recover their wits another car swishes by, and again the cry: 'The Austrians! The Austrians! The positions have been surrendered. . . . Gas! Quick, quick, back, back!'

"It was a panic, infecting everyone like a lightning epidemic. . . . Treachery perpetrated according to the book, with amazing astuteness, obviously in accordance with a deliberate and premeditated plan. . . . We counted more than twenty of these cars without number plates. . . . Seven of them we detained, and of course we found that the occupants were strangers, totally unconnected with our regiments. . . . But about eighteen of them got away. The companies, stunned by the warning cries and by the recoiling of the companies ahead, turned and fled. . . . The Austrians entered a deserted town, deserted suburbs, and advanced deeper and deeper into our positions as if they were on a Sunday promenade—there was nobody to hinder them. . . .

"The other group is joined by soldier after soldier who had been at Tarnopol, two or three of them wearing university badges. And each supplements the picture of the *provoked retreat with some new detail*. The heroes of the retreat were rogues, spies, traitors. . . . Who are they? *The near future will give the answer*. But where are the others, who have not yet been caught or tracked down? Under what guise are they operating? What cries are they using to cover up their criminal activities? The men who witnessed the horrors of the Tarnopol retreat, the men at the front, believe that soon everything which until now has been secret will come to light, and that the revelation of this shameful secret will wipe the shameful stigma from the army that operated at Tarnopol, the victim of the most infamous treachery and deceit."

2) Excerpt from Borisov's article "Bolshevism and Our Defeat" (*Novoye Vremya*, August 15):

"We want to acquit Bolshevism of the baseless charge of being responsible for our defeat. We want to find out the real causes of our defeat, for *only then will we be able to avoid a repetition of the disaster*. Nothing is more fatal to the art of war than to seek for the causes of a military disaster where they do not lie. The July defeat was not due to Bolshevism alone; it was due to far more complicated causes, for otherwise the immensity of the defeat would indicate that Bolshevik ideas have an enormous, an extraordinary influence in the army, which, of course, is not and cannot be the case. In all probability the Bolsheviks themselves were astonished at the far-reaching consequences of their propaganda. But the misfortunes of the Russian army could be considered as being at an end if the trouble lay only with the Bolsheviks. Unfortunately, the nature of the defeat is much more complex; it was already foreseen by military experts before the offensive of June 18; in the 'exalted' talk of June 18 about 'revolutionary' regiments, in the 'red' flags, etc., there lurked a mortal danger.

"When dispatches were received at General Headquarters reporting the supposedly brilliant achievements of June 18, we—realising that nothing particularly brilliant had occurred, for we had only captured a number of fortified positions which under

present battle conditions the enemy had to sacrifice in order to ensure his own victory—said that, 'we shall be very lucky if the Germans do not launch a counterblow.' But the counterblow was launched, and the Russian army, like the French in 1815, was at once transformed into a panic-stricken mob. Clearly, the catastrophe was not due to Bolshevism alone, but to something deep-seated in the *army organism, which the higher command was unable to divine or understand.* It is this cause of our defeat, much graver than Bolshevism, that we want to discuss, as far as it is possible in a newspaper article, because time is short.

"German 'militarism' has established a rule of military science: '*The strongest form of action is the offensive.*' This German rule proved unsuitable for us from the very beginning of the war (the disastrous defeats of Samsonov and Rennenkampf): the only thing possible for raw generals and raw soldiers is defence with protected flanks. With the natural losses incurred in the war, the standard of our generals, officers and lower ranks deteriorated, and defence became for us the most advantageous form of action. If to this we add the development of a war of positions and the *crying inadequacy of our equipment*, then one does not have to be a Bolshevik, but only to have an understanding of the nature of things, to be very chary of 'offensives'! *Narodnoye Slovo* reports B. V. Savinkov as saying that, under the influence of Bolshevik agitation, the mass of the soldiers began to believe that deserters were not traitors to their country but followers of 'international socialism.' Every old officer, who knows our soldiers better than the 'Committees' do, will tell you that to think like that is to underrate our gallant and very sensible lower ranks. These men are imbued with sound common sense; they have a full and definite understanding of what the state is; they fully realise that generals and officers are also soldiers; they laugh at the novel (and senseless) substitution of the general term 'soldier' for 'lower ranks,' which has degraded that honourable title, for today even regimental tailors far back in the rear are also called 'soldiers'; and they fully understand that a 'deserter' is a deserter, i.e., a contemptible fugitive. And if the idea of 'refusing to take the offensive' advocated by the Bolsheviks began to be espoused by these sensible men of our army, it is only because it logically followed from the nature

of things, from all our experience in the war. An offensive means one thing to an Englishman or Frenchman; it means another thing to a Russian. The former are installed in excellent dugouts and enjoy every comfort; they wait for their powerful artillery to sweep everything away, and only then does the infantry go into action. We, however, have always and *everywhere fought with human masses, allowing our finest regiments to be annihilated.* Where are our Guards, where are our riflemen? A regiment which has been wiped out two or three times and as many times brought up to strength again, even if replenished with better elements than is actually the case, will hardly consider that 'the strongest form of action is the offensive,' particularly if we add that these enormous losses were not justified by the results. On the basis of this experience, the former high command agreed to strike only when it was absolutely necessary. It was in such a situation that Brusilov was allowed to strike his blow in Galicia in May 1916. Its feeble results only confirmed the deductions from experience. It is quite possible that if the former high command had still existed the 'offensive' would have figured in the directives only as an idea that conduced to raise the fighting spirit of the troops, but would never have been put into practice. But suddenly something happened which is extraneous to the art of war: 'dilettantism' took over the reins, and everybody began to shout for an 'offensive,' urging that it was absolutely necessary and placing faith in what sound military theory rejects, namely, special 'revolutionary' battalions, 'death' battalions, 'shock' battalions, failing to understand that all this was extremely raw material and, moreover, would perhaps be withdrawing the most spirited men from the other regiments, which would then be entirely transformed into 'offscourings and replacements.' We shall be told that the Allies demanded an 'offensive,' that they called us 'traitors.' We hold too high an opinion of the competent and efficient French General Staff to believe that their opinion coincided with the so-called public opinion of dilettantes in the art of war. Of course, in circumstances where the enemy is in the centre and we and our allies on the circumference, every blow struck at the enemy, even when it entails for us enormous casualties incommensurate with the results obtained, will always be advantageous to our allies, for it

diverts enemy forces from them. This is in the nature of things, and it is not due to the hardheartedness of our allies. But we must consider these things reasonably, with a sense of proportion, and not rush to have our people exterminated simply because an ally demands it. The art of war does not tolerate fantasies and it responds with immediate retribution. The enemy, who has a well-trained general staff, sees to that."

Proletary, No. 5,
August 18, 1917

Unsigned

WHO REALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEFEAT AT THE FRONT?

Additional evidence for a reply to this question will now be forthcoming every day. And every day will reveal more clearly how vile, how execrable was the conduct of those who tried to throw the blame for the July defeat at the front on the Bolsheviks.

Izvestia, the official organ of the Soviets, printed in its issue No. 147 an article entitled "The Truth About the Mlynov Regiment." This is a document of first-rate political importance.

On July 7, amid the turmoil of events in Petrograd, there appeared in the press, to everybody's surprise, a telegram from General Headquarters stating that the 607th Mlynov Regiment had "left the trenches without orders," that this had enabled the Germans to penetrate into our territory, and that the misfortune "is largely to be attributed to *the influence of Bolshevik agitation*. . . ." Accusation after accusation was hurled at the Bolsheviks, who were being slandered enough as it was. Hatred for the Bolsheviks knew no bounds. The entire "patriotic" press poured fresh fuel on the flames day by day. Every day slander blossomed more luxuriantly.

That was only very recently.

But what do we learn now?

It appears that the first and basic communication from General Headquarters, which served as the signal for the whole slander campaign, was utterly *false*. The Regimental Committee of the 607th Mlynov Regiment has now addressed a statement to the slanderers, which says:

"Were you present at the action of July 6?

"Do you know that the regiment, consisting of 798 men and 54 officers, defended a line of two and a half versts? Do you know that only twelve officers and 114 men came out of the battle alive, the rest having fallen in defence of their country (losses—75 per cent)?

"Do you know that the 607th regiment held its position for seven hours under hurricane fire of diabolical intensity, and, notwithstanding orders to retire at 8:30 to the support points, stood fast until 11 a.m. (from 3:30 a.m.)?

"And do you know what sort of trenches we were in, and what technical means of defence we had at our disposal? . . ."

But that is not all. *Izvestia* publishes the documents of an *official inquiry*, signed by Major-Generals Goshtoft and Gavrilov, acting chief of staff Kolesnikov and others, in which we read:

"The results of the inquiry show that . . . the 607th Mlynov Infantry Regiment and the Sixth Grenadier Division in general *cannot* be accused of treason, treachery or of having abandoned their positions without orders. *On July 6 the division fought and died.* . . . The division was wiped out by the fire of more than 200 enemy guns, itself having only 16."

And—*not a word* about pernicious Bolshevik agitation.

Such are the facts.

And even *Izvestia*, a newspaper ready to use any stick to beat the Bolsheviks with, writes in this connection:

"Of course, it is not the revolutionary structure of the army that is responsible for the defeat. *But the calumny to which it is subjected made it possible to lay the whole blame for the defeat on Bolshevik propaganda* and on the Committees which connived at it."

So that's it, gentlemen of *Izvestia*! But, forgive us for asking, did you not do the same thing yourselves? Did you not follow the example of the Black Hundred scoundrels in publishing revolting calumnies and despicable denunciations of the Bolsheviks? Did you not cry: Crucify the Bolsheviks, crucify them, they are to blame for everything! . . .

But listen further:

"And this calumny (fabricated at General Headquarters) is not a chance incident, it is part of a regular system!"—continues the official *Izvestia*. "Official communications from General Headquarters also charged the Guards Corps with treachery. . . . And we have seen how incompetent *counter-revolutionary generals* tried to lay the blame for their incompetence, which cost thousands of lives, on the army organisations. . . . That is what happened on a small scale at Stokhod, and that is what is being repeated on a huge scale now. . . . It was by sending such slanderous reports that counter-revolutionary headquarters were able to demand the disbandment of regiments and the abolition of Committees. It was with the aid of such calumny that they were able to shoot hundreds of men and to *fill the emptied prisons again*. By destroying the army's revolutionary organisations, they could again make it their tool and *wield it against the revolution*."

So that is what we have come to! Even our most rabid opponent, *Izvestia*, is compelled to admit that with the aid of calumny the counter-revolutionary generals have filled the emptied prisons again. And *whom* have they filled them with, sirs? With Bolsheviks, internationalists! And you of *Izvestia*, what were you doing,

sirs, when the prisons were being filled with our comrades? You were shouting together with the counter-revolutionary generals: "At 'em, at 'em!" Together with the worst enemies of the revolution you were crucifying old revolutionaries who had sealed their loyalty to the revolution with decades of self-sacrificing struggle. Together with the Kaledins, Alexinskys, Karinskys, Pereverzevs, Milyukovs and Burtsevs you were jailing Bolsheviks and were allowing the lie to be spread that the "Bolsheviks were in receipt of German gold"! . . .

Izvestia, in its fit of candour, goes on to say:

"Of course, they (the counter-revolutionary generals) knew that the false reports that regiment after regiment was abandoning its positions had given rise to uncertainty among all units as to whether they would be supported by their neighbours and the rear, whether their neighbours had not already retreated, and whether they would not simply fall into the hands of the enemy if they stuck to their positions.

"They knew all this—but their hatred of the revolution blinded them.

"And then, naturally, the regiments did abandon their positions, they heeded those who advised them to do so, they discussed at meetings whether to carry out orders or not. The panic spread. The army was transformed into a fear-crazed herd. . . . And then the reprisals started. The soldiers knew where they were to blame and where their commanders were to blame. And daily, in hundreds of letters, they are protesting: *We were betrayed under the tsar, we have been betrayed now, and it is we who are being punished for it!*" (*Izvestia*, No. 147.)

Does *Izvestia* realise what it has admitted in these words? Does it realise that these words are a complete vindication of the tactics of the Bolsheviks and an utter condemnation of the Socialist-Revolutionaries' and Mensheviks' entire position?

Indeed! Have not you yourselves admitted that the soldiers are being betrayed as they were under the tsar, have not you yourselves admitted that despicable reprisals are being wreaked on the soldiers? Yet you approve of the reprisals (you voted for the death penalty), you give them your benediction, you assist them! With what name do people who act like this deserve to be branded?!

Indeed! Have not you yourselves admitted that the generals upon whom the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers depend are guided in their actions by hatred of the revolution? Yet you place millions of soldiers at the mercy of these generals, you give the offensive your benediction, you fraternise with these generals at the Moscow Conference!

But by doing so you sign your own death warrant, sirs! Where is the limit to your degradation?

We have heard the evidence of the *Izvestia* gentry, and we ask: If, as *Izvestia* says, General Headquarters slandered the Mlynov Regiment, if it played a dirty game at Stokhod, if it is guided not by considerations of national defence, but by considerations of the struggle against the revolution—if all this is true, what guarantee have we that the present information about the events on the Rumanian Front is not distorted also? What guarantee have we that the reactionaries are not deliberately and premeditatedly arranging defeat after defeat at the front?

Who Is Responsible
for the Defeat at the Front?
Pamphlet issued
by Priboy Publishers, Petrograd, 1917

AMERICAN BILLIONS

What the outcome of the Moscow Conference was is now becoming apparent.

Russkiye Vedomosti[71] (August 17, evening edition) reports:

"At a meeting of the Central Committee of the Popular Freedom Party yesterday, Milyukov presented a report and invited the members of the Committee to express their opinions on the results of the Moscow Conference. The speakers unanimously approved the principle of coalition. The majority of the members present agreed that the Moscow Conference had yielded the maximum that could have been expected of it."

And so, Mr. Milyukov's party is satisfied. It is for a coalition.

"The Moscow Conference," write the defencists, "was a victory for the democracy (for the defencists, that is?) which has succeeded in these tragic times in coming forward as a genuine state force around which has rallied all(!) that is virile in Russia" (*Izvestia*, No. 146).

Evidently, the defencist party is also satisfied. At all events, it pretends to be satisfied, since it, too, is for a coalition.

Well, and what about the government? How does it appraise the Moscow Conference?

According to *Izvestia* (No. 146), "the general impression of the members of the Provisional Government" is that

"the conference was a council of state in the true sense of the word. *In general, the government's foreign and home policies were approved.* Its economic programme encountered no objection. Nor, essentially speaking, were there any attacks on the government's land policy."

In a word, the government is also satisfied with the conference, since it, too, it appears, is for a coalition.

Everything is quite clear. A coalition is being arranged, a coalition of three forces: the government, the Cadets, and the defencists.

An "honest coalition" under the trade mark of Kerensky, Milyukov and Tsereteli can at present be regarded as assured.

Such is the first outcome of the Moscow Conference.

Under capitalism, not a single enterprise can get along without capital. The coalition now formed with the government at its head is the biggest enterprise in Russia. It will not be able to exist a single hour, a single minute, without the necessary capital. Especially now, in time of war, which requires incalculable resources. The question arises:

What capital does this new (brand new!) coalition intend to live on?

Listen to *Birzhovka* (August 17, evening edition):

"The most immediate outcome of the Moscow Conference, and especially of the sympathy the Americans displayed for it, it is reported, is the possibility of floating a *5,000 million ruble government loan* abroad. The loan will be floated *in the American market.* This loan will ensure the carrying out of the Provisional Government's minimum financial programme."

The answer is clear. The coalition will live on American billions, which the Russian workers and peasants will afterwards have to sweat for.

A coalition of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie (Milyukov!), the military (Kerensky!) and the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie that are obsequiously serving the "virile forces" of Russia (Tsereteli!), *financed* by the American imperialist bourgeoisie—that is the present picture.

The "sympathy" of American capital for the Moscow Conference backed by a 5,000 million ruble loan—was it not this that the gentry who convened the conference were after?...

It used to be said in Russia that the light of socialism came from the West. And this was true; for it was there, in the West, that we learned revolution and socialism.

With the beginning of the revolutionary movement in Russia the situation somewhat changed.

In 1906, when the revolution in Russia was only developing, the West helped the tsarist reactionaries to recover by lending them 2,000 million rubles. And tsarism did indeed recover, at the cost of the further financial subjection of Russia to the West.

Apropos of this, it was remarked at the time that the West was exporting not only socialism to Russia, but also reaction, in the shape of thousands of millions in money.

Now a more eloquent picture is unfolding. At a moment when the Russian revolution is exerting every effort to uphold its gains, and when imperialism is striving to crush it, American capital is supplying thousands of millions to a Kerensky-Milyukov-Tsereteli coalition

for the purpose of completely curbing the Russian revolution and thus undermining the mounting revolutionary movement in the West.

Such is the fact.

It is not socialism and emancipation that the West is exporting to Russia so much as subjection and counter-revolution. Is that not so?

But a coalition is an alliance. Against whom is the Kerensky-Milyukov-Tsereteli alliance directed?

Evidently, against those who did not attend the Moscow Conference, who boycotted it, who fought it—namely, the revolutionary workers of Russia.

An "honest coalition" of Kerensky, Milyukov and Tsereteli, financed by the American capitalists, *against* the revolutionary workers of Russia—is that not so, Messieurs the defencists?

Very good, we make note of it.

Proletary, No. 6,
August 19, 1917

Editorial

THIS IS ELECTION DAY

The elections to the Petrograd City Duma take place today. The outcome will depend on you, comrade workers, and on you, comrade soldiers. The elections are universal and equal. The vote of every soldier, of every working man and every working woman will be equal to the vote of any capitalist, housecowner, professor or government official. You, and you alone, comrades, will be to blame if you do not make full use of this right.

You were capable of battling against the tsarist police in the streets—be capable now of battling for your interests by voting for our Party!

You were capable of defending your rights against the counter-revolutionaries—be capable now of denying them your confidence in today's elections!

You were capable of tearing the mask from the betrayers of the revolution—be capable now of crying to them: "Hands off!"

You have before you, first of all, *Milyukov's party, the Party of Popular Freedom.* That party champions the interests of the landlords and capitalists. It is opposed to the workers, peasants and soldiers, for it is against workers' control of industry, against the transfer of the

landed estates to the peasants, and in favour of the death penalty for soldiers at the front. It was that party, the Cadet Party, that already in the beginning of June demanded an immediate offensive at the front, which has cost the country hundreds of thousands of lives. It was that party, the Cadet Party, that worked for and at last achieved a triumph for the counter-revolution and the wreaking of reprisals on the workers, soldiers and sailors. To vote for Milyukov's party would be to betray yourselves, your wives and children, and your brothers in the rear and at the front.

Comrades, *not a single vote for the Party of Popular Freedom*!

You have before you, next, the *defencists, the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties.* These parties champion the interests of the well-to-do small proprietors of town and country. That is why every time the class struggle assumes a decisive character they are to be found in the same camp as the landlords and capitalists against the workers, peasants and soldiers. So it was in the July days, when the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, disarmed and struck at the workers and soldiers. So it was at the time of the Moscow Conference, when these parties, in alliance with the bourgeoisie, endorsed repressive measures and the death penalty against the workers and the soldiers at the front.

One of the reasons for the victory of the counter-revolutionaries is that the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties helped them to curb the revolution by concluding an agreement with the landlords and capitalists.

One of the reasons why the counter-revolutionaries are now consolidating their positions is that the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties are shielding them from the wrath of the people and, under the guise of revolution, are carrying out their commands.

To vote for these parties would be to vote for an alliance with the counter-revolutionaries against the workers and the poor peasants.

To vote for these parties would be to vote in favour of endorsing the arrests in the rear and the death penalty at the front.

Comrades, *not a single vote for the defencists, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries*!

You have before you, lastly, the *Novaya Zhizn group*, List No. 12. This group expresses the sentiments of the intellectuals whose heads are in the clouds and who are divorced from realities and the movement. That is why it is eternally wavering between revolution and counter-revolution, between war and peace, between the workers and the capitalists, between the landlords and the peasants.

On the one hand it is for the workers, on the other it does not want to break with the capitalists—and that is why it so shamefully repudiates the July demonstration of the workers and soldiers.

On the one hand it is for the peasants, on the other it declines to break with the landlords—and that is why it is opposed to the immediate transfer of the landed estates to the peasants and suggests waiting for the Constituent Assembly, the convocation of which has been postponed, perhaps forever.

In words, the *Novaya Zhizn* group is for peace; in deeds, it is against peace, for it *calls for support* of the "Liberty Loan," which is intended for the purpose of continuing the imperialist war.

But whoever supports the "Liberty Loan" helps to prolong the war, helps imperialism, and in fact fights internationalism.

In words, the *Novaya Zhizn* group is against repressions and jailings; in deeds, it is in favour of repressions and jailings, for it has entered into an alliance with the defencists, who support both repressions and jailings.

But whoever enters into an alliance with the defencists helps the counter-revolution, and in fact fights the revolution!

Comrades, learn to judge people by their deeds, not by their words!

Learn to appraise parties and groups by their actions, not by their promises!

If the *Novaya Zhizn* group proposes a fight for *peace* and at the same time appeals for support of the "Liberty Loan," then you can be certain that it is bringing grist to the mill of the imperialists.

If the *Novaya Zhizn* group sometimes flirts with the Bolsheviks and at the same time supports the defencists, then you can be certain that it is bringing grist to the mill of the counter-revolutionaries.

To vote for this double-faced group, to vote for List No. 12, would be to enter the service of the defencists, who in their turn are serving the counter-revolutionaries.

Comrades, *not a single vote for the Novaya Zhizn group*!

Our Party is the party of the urban and rural workers, the party of the poor peasants, the party of the oppressed and exploited.

All the bourgeois parties, all the bourgeois newspapers, all the vacillating, lukewarm groups detest and vituperate our Party.

Why?

Because:

Our Party is the only one that stands for a revolutionary struggle against the landlords and capitalists;

Our Party is the only one that stands for the immediate transfer of the landed estates to the Peasant Committees;

Our Party is the only one that stands for workers' control of industry in opposition to all the capitalists;

Our Party is the only one that stands for a democratic organisation of commodity exchange between town and country in opposition to the profiteers and marauders;

Our Party is the only one that stands for the complete liquidation of counter-revolution in the rear and at the front;

Our Party is the only one that staunchly protects the revolutionary organisations of the workers, peasants and soldiers;

Our Party is the only one that wages a resolute and revolutionary fight for peace and brotherhood among nations;

Our Party is the only one that fights determinedly and steadfastly for the conquest of power by the workers and poor peasants;

Our Party, and our Party alone, is free from the stigma of having supported the death penalty at the front.

That is why the bourgeois and landlords detest our Party so heartily.

That is why you must vote today for our Party.

Workers, soldiers, working women,

Vote for Our Party, for List No. 6!

Proletary, No. 7,
August 20, 1917

Editorial

A PERIOD OF PROVOCATION

Provocation is a tried and tested weapon of counter-revolution.

The massacre of June 1848, the surrender of Paris in 1871, provocation in the rear and at the front as a means of combating revolution—who is not familiar with these perfidious methods of the bourgeoisie?

But nowhere in the world has the bourgeoisie resorted to this poisonous weapon so brazenly and freely as here in Russia.

Did not Ryabushinsky openly and publicly threaten recently that in the last resort the bourgeoisie would not hesitate to call in the aid of the "gaunt hand of famine and destitution" to subdue the workers and peasants?

And has not the bourgeoisie already passed from word to deed by closing down mills and factories and throwing tens of thousands of workers on to the streets?

Who would undertake to say that this is fortuitous and not a deliberate plan to provoke a massacre and drown the revolution in blood?

But the principal sphere of provocation is not the rear but the front.

Already in March there was talk of certain generals planning to surrender Riga. They failed for "reasons beyond their control."

This July the Russian forces evacuated Tarnopol and Czernowitz. With one accord the bourgeois press hirelings accused the soldiers and our Party of being responsible. And then? It turned out that "the retreat was provoked," that the "treachery was perpetrated according to the book, in accordance with a deliberate and premeditated plan." And certain generals are being definitely mentioned as having made the arrangements for the automobiles to dash from unit to unit, ordering the soldiers to retreat.

Who would undertake to say that the counter-revolutionaries are empty windbags who know not what they do?

Now Riga's turn has come. The telegraph brings the news that Riga has been surrendered. The bourgeois press hirelings have already started a hue and cry against the soldiers, alleging that they are fleeing in disorder. The counter-revolutionary General Headquarters, in union with *Vecherneye Vremya*, is trying to throw the blame on the revolutionary soldiers. We shall not be surprised if a demonstration is started on the Nevsky Prospect today with the cry: "Down with the Bolsheviks!"

Yet the telegrams of Voitinsky, Assistant Commissar at Riga, leave no doubt that the soldiers are being slandered.

"Before all Russia," Voitinsky telegraphs, "I testify that the troops faithfully carried out all the orders of their commanders and went to certain death."

Such is the testimony of an eyewitness.

But General Headquarters keeps slandering the soldiers, asserting that regiments took to flight.

And the bourgeois press keeps harping on "treachery" at the front.

Is it not clear that the counter-revolutionary generals and the bourgeois press are slandering the soldiers in fulfilment of some definite plan?

Is it not clear that this plan is as like as two peas to the plan staged at Tarnopol and Czernowitz?

And is it not clear, lastly, that the period of provocation which has set in in Russia is the instrument of the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the complete liquidation of which must be the primary task of the proletariat and the revolutionary soldiers?

Proletary, No. 8,
August 22, 1917

Editorial

DIVISION OF LABOUR IN THE "SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARY" PARTY

At the last meeting of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies the Socialist-Revolutionaries voted for the abolition of the death penalty and joined in protesting against the arrest of Bolsheviks.

That, of course, is very good and very commendable.

But we take the liberty in this connection of asking one modest question:

Who introduced the death penalty at the front, and *who* arrested the Bolsheviks?

Wasn't it the *Socialist-Revolutionaries* (with the gracious assistance of the Cadets and Mensheviks!)? As far as we know, citizen A. F. Kerensky, the Prime Minister, is a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. His name adorns the list of candidates of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in the elections to the Petrograd City Duma.

As far as we know, citizen B. V. Savinkov, Deputy Minister of War, is also a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

Well, wasn't it these two prominent "Socialist-Revolutionaries" who were primarily responsible for the restoration of the death penalty at the front? (To them should be added General Kornilov, but he has not joined the Socialist-Revolutionary Party so far.)

Further, we know that citizen Chernov, Minister of Agriculture, is also supposed to be a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

And lastly, citizen N. D. Avksentyev, Minister of the Interior, that is to say the person who, next to Kerensky, occupies the most prominent post in the cabinet, is also a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

Well, wasn't it all these right honourable "Socialist-Revolutionaries" who introduced the death penalty at the front and arrested the Bolsheviks?

One may ask: What is this strange division of labour in the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, that some of its members vehemently protest against the introduction of the death penalty while others introduce it with their own hands?. . .

It is truly astonishing! It was so very recently that we overthrew the autocratic system, it was so very recently that we began to live "in the European manner," yet we have adopted at once all the objectionable features of "Europeanism." Take any bourgeois-radical party—in France, let us say. It will unfailingly call itself a socialist party—"Radical Socialist," "Independent Socialist," etc., etc. Before the electors, the masses, the "lower orders," these parties always scatter "Left" phrases, particularly on the eve of elections, and particularly when they are being hard pressed by a competitor, a genuine socialist party. But "at the top," the

"Radical Socialist" and "Independent Socialist" government ministers calmly carry on with their bourgeois work, totally regardless of the socialist aspirations of their electors.

That is how the Socialist-Revolutionaries are behaving now.

A happy party! Who introduced the death penalty? The Socialist-Revolutionaries! Who protested against the death penalty? The Socialist-Revolutionaries!—You pay your money and take your choice. . . .

The Socialist-Revolutionaries hope in this way to preserve their innocence (retain their popularity with the masses) and make a fortune nevertheless (retain their Ministerial portfolios).

But, it will be said, disagreements occur in every party; some members think one way, others another.

Yes, but there are disagreements and disagreements. If some are for the hangmen and others against, to reconcile such "disagreements" within one party is rather difficult. And if, moreover, it is the most responsible leaders of the party, the government ministers, who are for the hangmen, and put their opinion into practice straightaway, every politically-minded person will judge the party's policies by the actions of these ministers, and not by this or that resolution of protest which the party rank and file may endorse.

The shame has not been wiped out. The Socialist-Revolutionary Party remains a death penalty party, a jailers' party which arrests working-class leaders. The Socialist-Revolutionaries will never rid themselves of the shameful stigma that it was prominent members of *their* party who re-introduced the death

penalty. They will never wash off the stain that it was *their* government that encouraged the infamous calumniation of the leaders of the workers' party; that it was *their* government that tried to stage a new Dreyfus affair[72] against Lenin. . . .

Proletary, No. 9,
August 23, 1917

Unsigned

YELLOW ALLIANCE

The Russian revolution is not something isolated. It is vitally bound up with the revolutionary movement in the West. More, it is a part of that great movement of the proletarians of all countries whose mission it is to shatter the very foundations of world capitalism. It is quite natural that every step of our revolution should inevitably call forth an answering tide in the West, that every one of its victories should call forth animation and growth in the world revolutionary movement and stimulate the workers of all countries to fight capital.

This the West-European imperialist sharks cannot but know. They have therefore decided to declare war to the death on the Russian revolution.

The British and French capitalists launched a campaign against our revolution at its very inception. Already at that time their organs, *The Times*[73] and *Le Matin*,[74] reviled the revolutionary Soviets and Committees and demanded their dispersal.

Two months later, at a secret conference in Switzerland, the imperialists again discussed measures of combating the "spread of revolution" and directed their blows first and foremost against the revolution in Russia.

They are now passing to an open attack, using the defeat at Riga as a pretext. Putting the whole blame on the soldiers, they call for the further intensification of counter-revolution in Russia.

Listen to the reports in *Birzheviye Vedomosti*.

Here is a dispatch from Paris:

"The retreat, or *rather the flight, of the Second Army without giving battle* and the fall of Riga have called forth here a *spasm of pain, indignation and disgust.*

"The *Matin* asserts that the Russian pacifists, who are to blame for this disaster, have proved *just as incompetent as the bad advisers of the former emperor, and even more harmful.*

"The paper declares that it *cannot understand the obstinacy of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies* in continuing, in spite of these tragic object lessons, to defend *such absurd institutions as the army committees.*"

So writes the organ of the French capitalists.

And here is a dispatch from London:

"The *Daily Chronicle* says that the first thing necessary is to restore discipline in the army. The Germans owe their swift and highly important victory to the same causes that enabled them to occupy Galicia and Bukovina, namely, *disobedience to orders and treachery among the Russian troops.*

So say the British imperialists.

"Flight... without giving battle," "absurd army committees," "restoration of discipline" (the death penalty is not enough for them!), "treachery among the Russian troops."

Such are the compliments these plutocrats shower on the Russian soldiers who are shedding their life-blood!

And that after the general admission of eyewitnesses that "although retreating, the army is offering staunch resistance to the enemy" and that "the troops in the area

of the breach are carrying out unquestioningly and honourably the tasks assigned them."!!!

But the point, of course, is not merely the abuse and vile calumnies showered on the soldiers.

The point is that in slandering the soldiers, the British and French capitalists are seeking to take advantage of the reverses at the front to get the revolutionary organisations in Russia completely suppressed and to secure the complete triumph of the dictatorship of imperialism.

That is the crux of the matter.

When Purishkevich and Milyukov shed "crocodile" tears over the fall of Riga and slander the soldiers, and at the same time revile the Soviets and the Committees, it means that they are glad of the opportunity to demand further repressive measures, so as to bring about the complete triumph of the landlords and capitalists.

When the Western imperialists talk about a "spasm of pain" over the fall of Riga and put the whole blame on the soldiers, and at the same time abuse the "absurd army committees," it means that they are glad of the opportunity to smash the last remnants of the revolutionary organisations in Russia.

That, and that alone, is the political import of the joint campaign of lies and calumny against the Russian soldiers who are laying down their lives on the Northern Front.

An alliance of native and European imperialists who are slandering the soldiers for the purpose of exploiting the military defeat at Riga *against* the Russian revolution which is shedding its life-blood—that is the situation we have now.

Let the workers and soldiers remember this!

Let them know that only in alliance with the workers of the West, only by shaking the foundations of capitalism in the West, can they count on the triumph of the revolution in Russia!

Let them know this, and let them bend every effort to confront the yellow alliance of the imperialists with the Red alliance of the revolutionary workers and soldiers of all countries.

Rabochy, No. 1,
August 25, 1917

Editorial

EITHER—OR[75]

Events are moving. Coalition succeeds coalition, repressions at the front are followed by repressions in the rear—and "all to no effect," because the cardinal evil of our day, the general state of disruption of the country, continues to grow and is assuming ever more menacing proportions.

The country is on the eve of famine. Kazan and Nizhni-Novgorod, Yaroslavl and Ryazan, Kharkov and Rostov, the Donets Basin and the Central Industrial region, Moscow and Petrograd, the front and the immediate rear—all these and many other areas are in the throes of an acute food crisis. Hunger riots have already broken out, and are being exploited, clumsily as yet, by counter-revolutionary agents. . . .

"The peasants are holding back grain," comes the complaint from everywhere.

But the peasants are "holding back grain" not "from stupidity," but because they have lost faith in the government and do not want to "assist" it any longer. In March and April the peasants believed in the Soviets, and, through them, in the government, and grain flowed in abundance both to the towns and to the front. Now they

are losing faith in the government because it protects the privileges of the landlords—and grain has ceased to flow. The peasants are hoarding their grain, preferring to wait for "better times."

The peasants are "holding back grain" not out of wickedness, but because there is nothing they can exchange it for. The peasants need calico, footwear, iron, paraffin, sugar, but these products are supplied to them in insufficient quantities; and there is no sense in exchanging grain for paper money, which is no substitute for manufactures and is moreover depreciating in value.

We say nothing of the "dislocation" of the transport system, which is too undeveloped to supply both the front and the rear equally well.

All this, coupled with the incessant mobilisations, which are robbing the countryside of its finest labour forces and resulting in curtailment of crop areas, inevitably leads to disruption of the food supply, from which both the rear and the front equally suffer.

At the same time, industrial disruption, too, is growing and spreading, tending in its turn to increase the disruption of the food supply.

Coal and oil "famines," iron and cotton "crises," causing textile, metallurgical and other plants to close down—that is now the familiar picture, confronting the country with the menace of industrial paralysis, mass unemployment and a goods shortage.

The trouble is not only that the mills and factories are producing chiefly for the war and cannot at the same time satisfy the needs of the country in equal measure, but also that the capitalists are artificially aggravating

these "famines" and "crises" in order either to raise prices (profiteering!), or to break the resistance of the workers, who, owing to the rising cost of living, are striving to get their wages raised (stay-in strikes of the capitalists!), or else to cause unemployment by shutting down plants (lockouts!) and drive the workers to outbreaks of desperation, in order to put an end to their "immoderate demands" "once and for all."

It is no secret that the Donets coal owners are engineering curtailment of production and promoting unemployment.

Everyone knows that the Transcaspian cotton planters are shouting about a cotton "famine" when they themselves are hoarding vast quantities of cotton with an eye to profiteering. And their friends, the textile manufacturers, who are sharing the fruits of this profiteering and are themselves organising it, hypocritically complain of a shortage of cotton, shut down their mills and increase the unemployment.

Everyone remembers Ryabushinsky's threat to "seize by the throat" the revolutionary proletariat "with the gaunt hand of famine and destitution."

Everyone knows that the capitalists have already passed from word to deed and have secured the unburdening of Petrograd and Moscow, the closing down of a whole number of factories.

The result is an advancing industrial paralysis and the threat of an absolute goods famine.

We say nothing of the profound financial crisis by which Russia is now gripped. A debt of 50,000-55,000 million rubles, involving an interest payment of 3,000 million rubles annually, at a time when productive forces are

in a state of general decline, speaks eloquently enough of the drastic state of Russia's finances.

The recent "setbacks" at the front, so successfully provoked by some skilful hand, only supplement the general picture.

The country is heading irresistibly towards an unparalleled catastrophe.

The government, which in a brief period has enacted a thousand and one repressive measures but not a single "social reform," is absolutely incapable of saving the country from mortal danger.

More, by obeying the will of the imperialist bourgeoisie on the one hand, and being reluctant on the other to abolish the "Soviets and Committees" at once, the government is stirring up an outburst of general discontent from both the Right and the Left.

On the one hand, the imperialist clique, headed by the Cadets, bombards the government with demands for "vigorous" measures against the revolution. When Purishkevich the other day spoke of the necessity for a "military dictatorship" of "governor-generals" and for the "arrest of the Soviets," he was only frankly expressing the aspirations of the Cadets. They are supported by Allied capital, which is bringing pressure to bear on the government by drastically forcing down the exchange rate of the ruble on the bourse and peremptorily demanding: "Russia must fight, not talk" (*Daily Express*, see *Russkaya Volya*,[76] August 18).

All power to the imperialists, home and Allied—such is the slogan of the counter-revolution.

On the other hand, profound discontent is brewing among the worker and peasant masses, who are doomed to

land hunger and unemployment and are subjected to repressive measures and the death penalty. The swing to the Left of the soldier-peasant masses, who only yesterday still trusted the compromisers, was very clearly reflected in the Petrograd elections, which undermined the strength and prestige of the compromising parties.

All power to the proletariat, supported by the poor peasants—such is the slogan of the revolution.

Either, or!

Either with the landlords and capitalists, and then the complete triumph of the counter-revolution.

Or with the proletariat and the poor peasantry, and then the complete triumph of the revolution.

The policy of compromise and coalition is doomed to failure.

What is the solution?

It is necessary to break with the landlords and turn over the land to the Peasant Committees. This the peasants will understand, and grain will be forthcoming.

It is necessary to break with the capitalists and establish democratic control over the banks, mills and factories. This the workers will understand, and "productivity of labour" will rise.

It is necessary to break with the profiteers and marauders and organise trade between town and country on democratic lines. This the population will understand, and the famine will be stopped.

It is necessary to break the imperialist threads, which enmesh Russia on all sides, and proclaim fair conditions of peace. Then the army will understand why it is under arms, and if Wilhelm does not consent to such a peace, the Russian soldiers will fight him like lions.

It is necessary to "transfer" all power to the proletariat and the poor peasants. This the workers of the West will understand and they will, in their turn, launch an assault on their own imperialist cliques.

This will mean the end of the war and the beginning of the workers' revolution in Europe.

That is the solution indicated by the development of Russia and by the whole world situation.

Rabochy, No. 1,
August 25, 1917

Unsigned

WE DEMAND!

Events are moving fast. After the Moscow Conference came the surrender of Riga and the demand for repressive measures. After the unsuccessful slander campaign against the soldiers at the front came the provocative rumours about a "Bolshevik plot" and new demands for repressive measures. Now, after the exposure of the provocative rumours comes the open démarche of Kornilov, who demands the dismissal of the Provisional Government and the establishment of a military dictatorship. And, as in the July days, Milyukov's party, the Party of Popular Freedom, resigns from the government, thereby openly supporting Kornilov's counter-revolutionary conspiracy.

The upshot is the march of Kornilov's regiments on Petrograd for the purpose of establishing a military dictatorship, Kornilov's dismissal by the Provisional Government, Kerensky's announcement of a crisis, Kishkin's resignation from the Cadet Party, which is implicated in the plot, and the formation of a so-called revolutionary Directory.

And so:

It is a fact that the counter-revolution needed a "Bolshevik plot" in order to clear the way for Kornilov,

who is marching on Petrograd ostensibly for the purpose of "putting down the Bolsheviks."

It is a fact that the entire bourgeois press, from *Russkaya Volya* and *Birzhovka* to *Novoye Vremya* and *Rech*, has helped Kornilov during these days by assiduously spreading rumours of a "Bolshevik plot."

It is a fact that Kornilov's present action is merely the continuation of the notorious machinations of the counter-revolutionary higher army officers, who surrendered Tarnopol in July and Riga in August in order to exploit the "defeats" at the front for the purpose of achieving the "complete" triumph of counter-revolution.

It is a fact that the Cadet Party is now, as it was in July, in one camp with the traitors at the front and the foul counter-revolutionaries in the rear.

Our Party was right when it denounced the Cadets as the moving spirit of the bourgeois counter-revolution.

Our Party was right when, as early as the beginning of June, it called for a resolute struggle against the counter-revolution and the arrest of the "implicated" persons (Kaledin, etc.).

The counter-revolution did not begin yesterday nor with the Kornilov conspiracy. It began at least as far back as June, when the government assumed the offensive at the front and began to pursue a policy of repression; when the counter-revolutionary generals surrendered Tarnopol, threw the whole blame on the soldiers, and secured the restoration of the death penalty at the front; when the Cadets, sabotaging the government already in July and relying on the support of Allied capital, established their hegemony in the Provisional Government; and, lastly, when the leaders of the Central

Executive Committee, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, instead of breaking with the Cadets and uniting with the July demonstrators, turned their weapons against the workers and soldiers.

That is a fact which it would be absurd to deny.

The fight now going on between the coalition government and the Kornilov party is a contest not between revolution and counter-revolution, but between two different methods of counter-revolutionary policy. And the Kornilov party, the sworn enemy of the revolution, having surrendered Riga, does not hesitate to march on Petrograd for the purpose of preparing the ground for the restoration of the old regime.

The workers and soldiers will take every measure to administer a decisive rebuff to Kornilov's counter-revolutionary bands should they appear in revolutionary Petrograd.

The workers and soldiers will not permit the capital of Russia to be defiled by the filthy hands of enemies of the revolution.

They will defend the battle standard of the revolution with their lives.

They will defend the battle standard of the revolution, however, not in order that one dictatorship alien to them in spirit might be replaced by another no less alien to them, but in order to pave the way for the complete triumph of the Russian revolution.

Today, when the country is stifling in the clutches of economic disruption and war, and the vultures of counter-revolution are plotting its doom, the revolution must find the strength and the means to save it from crumbling and disintegrating.

It is not the replacement of one set of "ruling" groups by another, and not playing at dictatorship that is needed now, but the complete liquidation of the bourgeois counter-revolution and resolute measures in the interests of the majority of the peoples of Russia.

To this end, the Bolshevik Party demands:

1) Immediate removal of the counter-revolutionary generals in the rear and at the front and their replacement by commanders elected by the soldiers and officers, and in general the complete democratisation of the army from top to bottom;

2) Restoration of the revolutionary soldiers' organisations, which alone are capable of establishing democratic discipline in the army;

3) Repeal of all repressive measures, and, in the first place, the death penalty;

4) Immediate placing of all landed estates at the disposal of the Peasant Committees, and supply of agricultural implements to the poor peasants;

5) Legislative enactment of an 8-hour day and institution of democratic control over factories, mills and banks, with representatives of the workers predominating in the control bodies;

6) Complete democratisation of the financial system—in the first place, ruthless taxation of capital and capitalist property and confiscation of the scandalous war profits;

7) Organisation of proper exchange between town and country, so that the towns receive the food supplies and the rural districts the manufactured goods they need;

8) Immediate proclamation of the right of the nations of Russia to self-determination;

9) Restoration of liberties, decreeing of a democratic republic, and immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly;

10) Annulment of the secret treaties with the Allies and proposal of terms for a universal democratic peace.

The Party declares that unless these demands are realised it will be impossible to save the revolution, which for half a year now has been stifling in the clutches of war and general disruption.

The Party declares that the only possible way of securing these demands is to break with the capitalists, completely liquidate the bourgeois counter-revolution, and transfer power in the country to the revolutionary workers, peasants and soldiers.

That is the only means of saving the country and the revolution from collapse.

Rabochy, No. 4,
August 28, 1917

Editorial

THE CONSPIRACY CONTINUES[77]

Who Are They?

Yesterday we wrote that the Cadets were the moving spirit of the counter-revolution. We affirmed this on the basis not only of "rumours" but of generally known facts—the resignation of the Cadets from the government at the critical moments of the "surrender" of Tarnopol in July and of the Kornilov conspiracy in August. For it could not have been fortuitous that both in July and in August the Cadets were in one camp with the traitors at the front and the most rabid counter-revolutionaries in the rear against the Russian people.

Today, *Izvestia* and the defencists, those inveterate compromisers with the Cadets, unreservedly confirm what we said about the Cadets yesterday.

"Lvov did not conceal," write the defencists, "that this (a military dictatorship) is desired not only by General Kornilov, *but also by a certain group of public men* who at the present moment are at General Headquarters" (*Izvestia*).

And so:

It is a fact that General Headquarters are the headquarters of the counter-revolution.

It is a fact that the general staff of the counter-revolution consists of "certain public men."

Who are these "public men"?

Let us see:

"*It has been established beyond a doubt* that a number of public men who have very close ideological and personal connections with representatives of the Cadet Party are implicated in the plot" (*Izvestia*).

And so:

It is a fact that Messieurs the defencists, who only yesterday were embracing the "virile forces" of the country in the person of "representatives of the Cadet Party," are today compelled to rank them as plotters against the revolution.

It is a fact that the plot has been organised and is being directed by "representatives of the Cadet Party."

Our Party was right when it asserted that the first condition for the victory of the revolution was a *rupture* with the Cadets.

What Are They Counting on?

Yesterday we wrote that the Kornilov party is the sworn enemy of the Russian revolution; that, after having surrendered Riga, Kornilov would not hesitate to surrender Petrograd in order to ensure the victory of the counter-revolution.

Today *Izvestia* unreservedly confirms our statement.

General Lukomsky, Chief of the General Staff, who is the actual soul of the revolt, states that "in the event of the Provisional Government rejecting General Kornilov's demand, internecine warfare at the front may lead to a breach in the front and the appearance of the enemy in places where we least expect him."

This sounds, does it not, very much like a threat to surrender Petrograd, say?

And here is an even more explicit statement:

"Evidently, in his effort to secure the success of the conspiracy, General Lukomsky will not shrink from downright treason. His threat that the rejection of General Kornilov's demand may lead to civil war at the front, to the opening of the front to the enemy, and the disgrace of a separate peace can only be regarded as signifying his firm determination to come to an arrangement with the Germans in order to secure the success of the conspiracy."

Do you hear this?—"an arrangement with the Germans," "opening of the front," a "separate peace.". . .

There you have the real "traitors" and "treasonmongers"—the Cadets, who "are implicated in the plot," and who are lending their presence at General Headquarters to hide the threat of an "opening of the front" and an "arrangement with the Germans."

For months on end these "front-opening" heroes have been reviling our Party, accusing it of "treason" and talking about "German gold." For months on end the yellow hirelings of the banks, *Novoye Vremya* and *Birzhovka*, *Rech* and *Russkaya Volya*, have been playing up these vile allegations. And what do we find? Even the defencists are now obliged to admit that the treachery—at the front—is the work of the commanders and their ideological inspirers.

Let the workers and soldiers remember this!

Let them know that the provocative howls of the bourgeois press about the "treachery" of the soldiers and the Bolsheviks were *only a camouflage* for the actual treachery of the generals and the "public men" of the Cadet Party.

Let them know that when the bourgeois press raises a howl about the "treachery" of the soldiers, it is a sure sign that the moving spirits behind that press have already planned treachery and are trying to throw the blame on the soldiers.

Let the workers and soldiers know this and draw the proper conclusions.

Do you want to know what they are counting on?

They are counting on "opening the front" and an "arrangement with the Germans," hoping to capture the war-weary soldiers with the idea of a separate peace and then march them against the revolution.

The workers and soldiers will realise that these traitors at General Headquarters must be shown no mercy.

The Conspiracy Continues...

Events are moving quickly. Facts and rumours come thick and fast. There are rumours, as yet unconfirmed, that Kornilov is negotiating with the Germans. There is definite talk of a skirmish between Kornilov regiments and revolutionary soldiers near Petrograd. Kornilov has issued a "manifesto" proclaiming himself dictator, the enemy and gravedigger of the conquests of the Russian revolution.

And the Provisional Government, instead of meeting the enemy as an enemy, prefers to confer with General Alexeyev and keeps on negotiating with Kornilov, keeps on pleading with the conspirators who are openly betraying Russia.

And the so-called "revolutionary democracy" is preparing for another "special conference on the lines of the

Moscow Conference, to be attended by representatives of all the virile forces of the country" (see *Izvestia*).

And at the same time the Cadets, who only yesterday were howling about a "Bolshevik plot," are today disconcerted by the exposure of the Kornilov plot, and are appealing for "common sense" and "harmony" (see *Rech*).

Evidently they want to "arrange" another compromise with those "virile forces" who, while howling about a Bolshevik plot, are themselves conspiring against the revolution and the Russian people.

But the compromisers are reckoning without their host; for the real host in the country, the workers and soldiers, want no conferences with enemies of the revolution. The information coming in from the districts and regiments uniformly shows that the workers are mustering their forces, that the soldiers are standing ready to arms. The workers, apparently, prefer to talk with the enemy as an enemy.

Nor could it be otherwise: you don't confer with enemies, you fight them.

The conspiracy continues. Prepare to resist it!

Rabochy, No. 5,
2nd, special edition,
August 28, 1917

Editorial

AGAINST COMPROMISE WITH THE BOURGEOISIE

The counter-revolution of the landlords and capitalists has been broken, but it has not yet been crushed.

The Kornilov generals have been beaten, but the triumph of the revolution is not yet assured.

Why?

Because, instead of implacably fighting the enemy, the compromisers are negotiating with him.

Because, instead of breaking with the landlords and capitalists, the defencists are arranging a compromise with them.

Because, instead of outlawing them, the government is inviting them into the Cabinet.

In South Russia, General Kaledin is raising a rebellion against the revolution, yet his friend, General Alexeyev, has been appointed Chief of the General Staff.

In the capital of Russia, Milyukov's party is openly supporting counter-revolution, yet its representatives, the Maklakovs and Kishkins, are invited into the Cabinet.

It is time to stop this crime against the revolution!

It is time to say resolutely and irrevocably that *enemies must be fought, not compromised with*!

Against the landlords and capitalists, *against* the generals and bankers; *for* the interests of the peoples of Russia, *for* peace, *for* liberty, *for* land!—that is our slogan.

A break with the bourgeoisie and landlords—that is the first task.

Formation of a government of workers and peasants—that is the second task.

Rabochy, No. 9,
August 31, 1917

Editorial

THE CRISIS AND THE DIRECTORY

After the Kornilov conspiracy and the disintegration of the government, after the breakdown of the conspiracy and the formation of the Kerensky-Kishkin cabinet, after the "new" crisis and the "new" Tsereteli-Gotz negotiations with this same Kerensky, we have at last a "new" (brand new!) five-man government.

A "Directory" of five: Kerensky, Tereshchenko, Verkhovsky, Verderevsky and Nikitin—such is the "new" government, "chosen" by Kerensky, endorsed by Kerensky, responsible to Kerensky, and *independent* of the workers, peasants and soldiers.

It is said that this government is independent, too, of the Cadets. But that is sheer nonsense, for the fact that there are no official representatives of the Cadets in the government is merely a camouflage for its complete dependence on the Cadets.

Ostensibly, Kerensky the Socialist-Revolutionary is Supreme Commander. Actually, the General Staff, i.e., complete control of the front, has been put in the hands of General Alexeyev, a placeman of the Cadets.

Ostensibly, the "Left" Directory is independent (no joke!) of the Cadets. Actually, the directors of the

Ministries, the men who really administer all the affairs of state, are placemen of the Cadets.

Professedly, a rupture with the Cadets. In reality, an agreement with placemen of the Cadets in the rear and at the front.

The Directory as a camouflage for an alliance with the Cadets, the dictatorship of Kerensky as a shield to protect the dictatorship of the landlords and capitalists from the anger of the people—such is the picture today.

And ahead lies another conference of representatives of the "virile forces," at which Messieurs the Tseretelis and Avksentyevs, those inveterate compromisers, will strive to convert yesterday's secret compromise with the Cadets into an open and explicit compromise, to the glee of the enemies of the workers and peasants.

In the past six months our country has witnessed three acute crises of power. On each occasion the crisis was resolved by a compromise with the bourgeoisie, and on each occasion the workers and peasants were fooled.

Why?

Because on each occasion the petty-bourgeois parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, intervened in the struggle for power, sided with the landlords and capitalists and decided the issue in favour of the Cadets.

The Kornilov conspiracy thoroughly exposed the counter-revolutionary nature of the Cadets. For three days the defencists clamoured about the treachery of the Cadets; for three days they clamoured about the impracticability of a coalition which fell to pieces at the very first clash with the counter-revolution. And what do we find? After all this they could think of nothing better

to do than to accept a camouflaged coalition with the very Cadets whom they had been abusing.

Only yesterday the defencist majority in the Central Executive Committee voted to "support" the five-man Directory, the product of backstage compromises with the Cadets to the detriment of the fundamental interests of the workers and peasants.

That day, when the crisis of power had become acute, when, with the smashing of Kornilov, the struggle for power had become intense, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries *once again* helped the landlords and capitalists to retain power, *once again* helped the counter-revolutionary Cadets to fool the workers and peasants.

That, and that alone, is the political import of yesterday's voting in the Central Executive Committee.

Let the workers know this, let the peasants know it, and let them draw the appropriate conclusions.

Today's masked coalition is just as unstable as yesterday's open coalitions: there can be no stable agreement between landlord and peasant, between capitalist and worker. And because of this the struggle for power, far from being ended, grows ever more intense and acute.

Let the workers know that in this struggle they will inevitably suffer defeat so long as the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks enjoy influence with the masses.

Let the workers remember that in order to take power the peasant and soldier masses must be wrested from the compromisers, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, and rallied around the revolutionary proletariat.

Let them remember that, and let them open the eyes of the peasants and soldiers by exposing the treachery of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

An implacable struggle must be waged against the influence of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks on the masses, work must be carried on tirelessly to rally the peasants and soldiers around the banner of the party of the proletariat—such is the lesson to be drawn from this recent crisis.

Rabochy Put, No. 1,
September 3, 1917

Editorial

THEY WILL NOT SWERVE FROM THEIR PATH

Marx attributed the weakness of the 1848 revolution in Germany among other things to the fact that there was no strong counter-revolution to spur on the revolution and to steel it in the fire of struggle.

We, Russians, have no reason to complain in this respect, for we have a counter-revolution, and quite a substantial one. And the latest actions of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois and generals, and the answering tide of the revolutionary movement demonstrated very graphically that the revolution is growing and gaining strength precisely in battles with counter-revolution.

In the heat of these battles the almost defunct Soviets and Committees, which were broken by the machinations of the bourgeoisie in July and August, have revived and are developing.

It was on the shoulders of these organisations that the revolution was lifted to victory over the counter-revolution.

Now that Kornilovism is retreating in disorder and Kerensky is unceremoniously appropriating the laurels of others, it has become particularly clear that had it not been for these organisations—the railwaymen's, soldiers', sailors', peasants', workers', post and telegraph and

other "unauthorised" Committees—that had it not been for their revolutionary initiative and independent militant action, the revolution would have been swept away.

All the more reason is there, therefore, for treating these organisations with respect. All the more reason is there, therefore, for energetically carrying on our work of strengthening and expanding these organisations. Let these "unauthorised" Committees live and develop; let them be strong and victorious!—such should be the slogan of the friends of the revolution.

Only enemies, only sworn enemies of the Russian people can raise their hand against the integrity of these organisations.

Yet from the very outbreak of the counter-revolution the Kerensky government treated the "unauthorised" Committees as suspect. Unable and unwilling to fight Kornilovism,fearing the masses and the mass movement more than counter-revolution, from the very outbreak of the Kornilov revolt it put obstacles in the way of the Petrograd People's Committee for Combating Counter-revolution. And it continued to sabotage the struggle against Kornilovism all along.

But it has not stopped there. On September 4, the Kerensky government issued a special order declaring open war upon the revolutionary Committees and outlawing them. Qualifying the activities of these Committees as "usurpation of authority," it says that:

"unauthorised actions can no longer be tolerated, and the Provisional Government will combat them as usurpation of authority detrimental to the republic."

Kerensky has evidently forgotten that the "Directory" has not yet been replaced by a "Consulate," and

that he is not First Consul of the Republic of Russia.

Kerensky evidently does not know that between the "Directory" and the "Consulate" there was a coup d'état, which had to be effected before orders like these could be issued.

Kerensky does not realise that to combat the "usurpatory" Committees in the rear and at the front he would have to rely upon the backing of the Kaledins and Kornilovs, and upon them alone. At all events, he would do well to remember their fate. . . .

We are confident that the revolutionary Committees will worthily parry this attempt of Kerensky's to stab them in the back.

We are firmly convinced that the revolutionary Committees *will not swerve from their path.*

And if the paths of the "Directory" and of the revolutionary Committees have definitely diverged, so much the worse for the "Directory."

The counter-revolutionary danger is not yet over. Long live the revolutionary Committees!

Rabochy Put, No. 3,
September 6, 1917

Editorial

THE BREAK WITH THE CADETS

The Kornilov revolt had not only a bad side; like everything in life it also had a good side. The Kornilov revolt was an attempt on the very life of the revolution. That is unquestionable. But in attempting to kill the revolution and stirring all the forces of society into motion, it thereby, on the one hand, gave a spur to the revolution, stimulated it to greater activity and organisation, and, on the other, revealed the true nature of the classes and parties, tore the mask from their faces and gave us a glimpse of their true countenances.

We owe it to the Kornilov revolt that the almost defunct Soviets in the rear and the Committees at the front instantaneously sprang to life again and became active.

We owe it to the Kornilov revolt that everybody is now talking about the counter-revolutionary nature of the Cadets, not excluding those who only yesterday were "convulsively" seeking agreement with them.

It is a fact that, "after all that has happened," even the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks no longer consider a coalition with the Cadets permissible.

It is a fact that even the five-man "Directory" set up by Kerensky had to dispense with official representatives of the Cadets.

One would think that breaking with the Cadets had become a commandment with the "democratic" parties.

That has been the good side of the Kornilov revolt.

But what does *breaking* with the Cadets imply?

Let us assume that the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have broken "finally" with the Cadets, as members of a definite party. But does that mean that they have broken with the policy of the Cadets, as representatives of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

No, it does not.

Let us assume that at the Democratic Conference which is to open on September 12 the defencists form a new government without the Cadets and that Kerensky submits to the decision. Will that mean that they will have broken with the policy of the Cadets, as representatives of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

No, it will not.

The French imperialist republic provides numerous examples of how the representatives of capital, while remaining out of the cabinet themselves, "admit" petty-bourgeois "Socialists" to it, so that they themselves might operate behind the scene and through the hand of others, and plunder the country without let or hindrance. We know from history how the financial bosses of France, by appointing "Socialists" (Briand! Viviani!) to the head of cabinets, while themselves hiding behind their backs, have successfully carried out the policy of their class.

It is quite possible to conceive the existence in Russia, too, of a non-Cadet cabinet which would consider it necessary to pursue a Cadet policy as the only possible one, owing, say, to the pressure of Allied capital, of which Russia is becoming a tributary, or to other circumstances.

Needless to say, if the worst came to the worst, the Cadets would not object to such a government; for, after all, does it make any difference who carries out the Cadet policy, so long as it is carried out?

Obviously, what matters is not the personal composition of the government, but its policy.

Therefore, whoever wants to break with the Cadets really, and not only ostensibly, must first of all break with the policy of the Cadets.

But breaking with the policy of the Cadets means breaking with the landlords and handing over their land to the Peasant Committees, regardless of the fact that such a measure would be a severe blow to certain all-powerful banks.

Breaking with the policy of the Cadets means breaking with the capitalists and establishing workers' control over production and distribution, regardless of the fact that it would mean encroaching on capitalist profits.

Breaking with the policy of the Cadets means breaking with the predatory war and the secret treaties, regardless of the fact that this measure would be a severe blow to the Allied imperialist cliques.

Are the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries capable of such a break with the Cadets?

No, they are not. For if they were, they would cease to be defencists, that is, advocates of war at the front and of class peace in the rear.

That being the case, what does the incessant clamour of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries about having broken with the Cadets amount to?

To a verbal break with the Cadets—nothing more!

The fact of the matter is that after the collapse of the Kornilov conspiracy and the exposure of the counter-revolutionary nature of Milyukov's party, open agreement with that party has become extremely unpopular among the workers and soldiers: the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have only to enter into such an agreement and they will lose the last remnants of their former army in a twinkling. Therefore, instead of an open agreement they are compelled to resort to a masked one. Hence their clamour about having broken with the Cadets, which is intended to cover up the backstage agreement they have made with the Cadets. For appearance's sake—down with the Cadets! Actually—alliance with the Cadets! For appearance's sake—a government *without* the Cadets! Actually—a government *for* the Cadets, home and Allied, who dictate their will to "the powers that be."

But it follows from this that Russia has entered a period of political development in which open agreement with the imperialist bourgeoisie is becoming a risky business. We are now in a period of governments of social-defencist, non-Cadet composition, whose mission it is, nevertheless, to carry out the will of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The "Directory" which appeared on the scene the other day was the first attempt to create such a government.

It is to be anticipated that the conference appointed for September 12 will, if it does not end in a farce, attempt to create a similar, and presumably "more Left" government.

It is the duty of the advanced workers to tear the mask from these non-Cadet governments and expose their real Cadet nature to the masses.

Rabochy Put, No. 3,
September 6, 1917

Signed: *K. St.*

THE SECOND WAVE

The first wave of the Russian revolution began as a struggle against tsarism. The workers and soldiers were at that time the main forces of the revolution. But they were not the only forces. Besides them, bourgeois liberals (Cadets) and the British and French capitalists were also "active," the former having turned their backs on tsarism because of its inability to drive a road to Constantinople, and the latter having betrayed it because of tsarism's desire for a separate peace with Germany.

There thus arose something in the nature of a concealed coalition, under whose pressure tsarism was compelled to quit the stage. On the day following the fall of tsarism, the secret coalition became an open one, having assumed the form of a definite agreement between the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet, between the Cadets and the "revolutionary democracy."

But these forces pursued entirely different aims. Whereas the Cadets and the British and French capitalists merely wanted to make a little revolution in order to exploit the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses for the purposes of a big imperialist war, the workers and soldiers, on the contrary, were striving for the complete break-up of the old regime and the full triumph of a great

revolution, in order, by overthrowing the landlords and curbing the imperialist bourgeoisie, to secure the cessation of the war and ensure a just peace.

This fundamental contradiction underlay the further development of the revolution. It also predetermined the instability of the coalition with the Cadets.

All the so-called crises of power, including the most recent, the one in August, were manifestations of this contradiction.

And if in the course of these crises success always proved to be with the imperialist bourgeoisie, and if after the "solution" of each crisis the workers and soldiers proved to have been deceived, and the coalition was preserved in one form or another, that was not only because of the high degree of organisation and the financial power of the imperialist bourgeoisie, but also because the vacillating upper sections of the petty bourgeoisie and their parties, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks—which still had the following of the broad mass of the petty bourgeoisie in our generally petty-bourgeois country—on each occasion took their stand "on the other side of the barricades" and decided the struggle for power in favour of the Cadets.

The coalition with the Cadets attained its greatest strength in the July days, when the members of the coalition formed a united battle front and turned their weapons against the "Bolshevik" workers and soldiers.

In this respect the Moscow Conference was merely an echo of the July days. The non-admission of the Bolsheviks to the conference was to have been a necessary surety for the cementing of the "honest coalition" with the "virile forces" of the country, inasmuch as the *isolation*

of the Bolsheviks was regarded as an essential condition for the stability of the *coalition* with the Cadets.

Such was the situation down to the Kornilov revolt.

Kornilov's action changed the picture.

It was already clear at the Moscow Conference that the alliance with the Cadets was threatening to become an alliance with the Kornilovs and Kaledins against . . . not only the Bolsheviks, but the entire Russian revolution, against the very existence of the gains of the revolution. The boycott of the Moscow Conference and the protest strike of the Moscow workers, which unmasked the counter-revolutionary conclave and thwarted the plans of the conspirators, was not only a warning in this respect; it was also a call to be prepared. We know that the call was not a voice crying in the wilderness, that a number of cities responded immediately with protest strikes. . . .

That was an ominous portent.

The Kornilov revolt only opened the floodgates for the accumulated revolutionary indignation; it only released the temporarily shackled revolution, spurred it on and impelled it forward.

And here, in the fire of battle against the counter-revolutionary forces, in which words and promises are tested by actual deeds in the direct struggle, it became revealed who really were the friends and who the enemies of the revolution, who really were the allies and who the betrayers of the workers, peasants and soldiers.

The Provisional Government, so painstakingly stitched together from heterogeneous materials, burst at the seams at the very first breath of the Kornilov revolt.

It is "sad," but true: the coalition looks like a force when it is a matter of talking about "saving the

revolution," but turns out to be a squib when it is a matter of really saving the revolution from mortal danger.

The Cadets resigned from the government and openly demonstrated their solidarity with the Kornilovites. The imperialists of all shades and degrees, the bankers and manufacturers, the factory owners and profiteers, the landlords and generals, the pen pirates of *Novoye Vremya* and the cowardly provocateurs of *Birzhovka* were all, with the Cadet Party at their head and in alliance with the British and French imperialist cliques, found to be in one camp with the counter-revolutionaries—against the revolution and its conquests.

It became manifest that alliance with the Cadets meant alliance with the landlords against the peasants, with the capitalists against the workers, with the generals against the soldiers.

It became manifest that whoever compromised with Milyukov compromised with Kornilov and must come out against the revolution, for Milyukov and Kornilov "are one."

A vague inkling of this truth was the underlying reason for the new mass revolutionary movement, for the second wave of the Russian revolution.

And if the first wave *ended* with the triumph of the coalition with the Cadets (the Moscow Conference!), the second *began* with the collapse of this coalition, with open war against the Cadets.

In the struggle against the counter-revolution of the generals and Cadets the almost defunct Soviets and Committees in the rear and at the front are coming to life again and growing in strength.

In the struggle against the counter-revolution of the generals and Cadets new revolutionary Committees of workers and soldiers, sailors and peasants, railwaymen and post and telegraph employees are coming into being.

In the fires of this struggle new local organs of power are arising in Moscow and the Caucasus, in Petrograd and the Urals, in Odessa and Kharkov.

The reason is not the new resolutions passed by Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who have undoubtedly moved towards the Left in these past few days—although this, of course, is of no little importance.

Nor is the reason the "victory of Bolshevism," with the spectre of which the bourgeois press is browbeating the scared philistines of *Dyen* and *Volya Naroda*.

The reason is that *in the struggle* against the Cadets, and *in spite of* them, a new power is arising, which has defeated the forces of counter-revolution in open battle.

The reason is that, passing from the defensive to the offensive, this new power is inevitably encroaching upon the vital interests of the landlords and capitalists, and is thereby rallying around itself the worker and peasant masses.

The reason is that, acting in this way, this "unrecognised" power is compelled by force of circumstances to raise the question of its "legalisation," while the "official" power, which has betrayed a manifest kinship with the counter-revolutionary conspirators, turns out to have no firm ground under its feet.

And the reason, lastly, is that in the face of this new wave of revolution, which is rapidly spreading to new cities and regions, the Kerensky government, which yesterday was still afraid to give decisive battle to the Kornilov

counter-revolution, is today uniting with Kornilov and the Kornilovites in the rear and at the front, and at the same time "ordering" the dissolution of the centres of revolution, the "unauthorised" workers', soldiers' and peasants' Committees.

And the more thoroughly Kerensky links himself with the Kornilovs and Kaledins, the wider grows the rift between the people and the government, the more probable becomes a rupture between the Soviets and the Provisional Government.

It is these facts, and not the resolutions of individual parties, that pronounce the death sentence on the old compromising slogans.

We are by no means inclined to overrate the extent of the rupture with the Cadets. We know that that rupture is still only a formal one. But for a start, even such a rupture is a big step forward. It is to be presumed that the Cadets themselves will do the rest. They are already boycotting the Democratic Conference. The representatives of trade and industry, whom the cunning strategists of the Central Executive Committee wanted to "entice into their net," are following in the footsteps of the Cadets. It is to be presumed that they will go further and continue to close down mills and factories, refuse credits to the organs of "the democracy" and deliberately aggravate the economic disruption and food scarcity. And "the democracy," in its efforts to overcome the economic disruption and food scarcity, will inevitably be drawn into a resolute struggle with the bourgeoisie and will widen its rupture with the Cadets. . . .

Seen in this perspective and in this connection, the Democratic Conference convened for September 12 is

particularly symptomatic. What its outcome will be, whether it will "take" power, whether Kerensky will "yield"—all these are questions which cannot be answered yet. The initiators of the conference may possibly try to find some cunning "compromise" formula. But that, of course, is of no significance. Fundamental questions of revolution, the question of power in particular, are not settled at conferences. But one thing is certain, and that is that the conference will be a summing up of the events of the past few days, will provide an estimate of the forces, will disclose the difference between the first, already receded, wave and the second, advancing wave of the Russian revolution.

And we shall learn that:

Then, at the time of the first wave, the fight was against tsarism and its survivals. Now, at the time of the second wave, the fight is against the landlords and capitalists.

Then—an alliance with the Cadets. Now—a rupture with them.

Then—the isolation of the Bolsheviks. Now—the isolation of the Cadets.

Then—an alliance with British and French capital, and war. Now—a ripening rupture with it, and peace, a just and general peace.

That, and that alone, will be the course of the second wave of the revolution, no matter what the Democratic Conference may decide.

Rabochy Put, No. 6,
September 9, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

FOREIGNERS AND THE KORNILOV CONSPIRACY

In connection with the Kornilov conspiracy a mass exodus of foreigners from Russia is lately to be observed. The bourgeois press hacks seek to suggest a connection between this phenomenon and "rumours of peace" or even the "triumph of Bolshevism" in Petrograd and Moscow. But this blatant and shallow stratagem of the yellow press is designed to conceal from the reader the real reason for the exodus. The real reason is the undeniable fact that certain foreigners were implicated in the Kornilov conspiracy, and now these brave gentry are wisely seeking to escape being called to account.

It is known that the armoured cars which escorted the "Savage Division" to Petrograd were manned by foreigners.

It is known that certain representatives of the embassies at General Headquarters not only knew of the Kornilov conspiracy, but helped Kornilov in hatching it.

It is known that the adventurer Aladin, agent of *The Times* and the imperialist clique in London, who on his arrival from England went straight to the Moscow Conference and then "proceeded" to General Headquarters, was the moving spirit and the first fiddle of the Kornilov revolt.

It is known that already in June a certain prominent representative of the most prominent embassy in Russia

definitely associated himself with the counter-revolutionary machinations of Kaledin and the others, and backed his association with substantial subsidies out of the funds of his patrons.

It is known that *The Times* and *Le Temps*[78] did not conceal their displeasure at the failure of the Kornilov revolt and abused and vilified the revolutionary Committees and Soviets.

It is known that the Provisional Government's commissars at the front were constrained to issue a definite warning to certain foreigners who were behaving in Russia like Europeans in Central Africa.

It is known that it was owing to such "measures" that the mass exodus of foreigners began, and that the Russian authorities, not desiring to allow valuable "witnesses" to slip from their hands, were obliged to take measures against the exodus, and that Buchanan (Buchanan himself!), evidently fearing exposure, took "measures" in his turn and recommended members of the British colony to leave Russia. Buchanan now "categorically denies" the "rumours" that *all* the members of the British colony in Petrograd were recommended by the British ambassador to leave Russia (see *Rech*). But, in the first place, this strange "denial" only corroborates the "rumours." Secondly, what good are these false "denials" now that some of the foreigners (not "*all*," but some of them!) have already left—slipped away?

All that, we repeat, is old and stale.

Even the "dumb stones" are crying it.

And if, after all that, certain "government circles," and especially the bourgeois press, are trying to hush up the matter by putting the "blame" on the Bolsheviks,

that is a sure sign that those "circles" and that press "in their heart of hearts" fully sympathise with the counter-revolutionary schemes of "certain foreigners."

Listen to what *Dyen*, organ of "socialist thought," has to say:

> "In connection with the mass exodus of foreigners—French and British—from Russia it is regretfully remarked in Provisional Government circles that it is not surprising that foreigners prefer, in view of the unstable situation in the country, not to incur the risk of unpleasantness. Unfortunately, there is some basis for the assertion that in the event of the complete triumph of the Bolsheviks the representatives of foreign powers will prefer to leave Russia" (*Dyen*, September 10).

So writes the organ of the philistines who are scared by the spectre of Bolshevism.

So "remark," and, moreover, "regretfully remark," certain anonymous "circles" of the Provisional Government.

There can be no doubt whatever that the yellow elements of all countries are uniting and plotting against the Russian revolution, that the hacks of the bankers' press are trying to justify that "work" with vociferous and mendacious talk about a "Bolshevik danger," and that anonymous government "circles," in obedience to the behest of the British and French imperialists, hypocritically point a finger at the Bolsheviks and clumsily endeavour to justify the absconding criminals by falsely prating about the "unstable situation" in Russia.

What a picture! . . .

Rabochy Put, No. 8,
September 12, 1917

Signed: *K.*

THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

The Democratic Conference opens today.

We shall not stop to discuss why a conference, and not a Congress of Soviets was convened. There can be no denying that in appealing at a difficult moment of history not to a Congress of Soviets, but to a conference in which bourgeois elements participate, the Central Executive Committee, which was elected by a Congress of Soviets, is guilty not only of a gross breach of formality, but also of an impermissible substitution of the will of the anti-revolutionary classes for the will of the revolutionary classes. It was obviously the "idea" of the leaders of the Central Executive Committee to bring in the propertied elements at all costs. . . .

Nor shall we stop to discuss why a number of workers' and soldiers' Soviets, which defeated the forces of counter-revolution in open combat, have been denied a voice at a conference which has been convened to decide the question of power, while propertied elements who directly or indirectly supported the counter-revolutionaries have been allowed a voice. It has generally been the case in the history of revolutions that the bourgeoisie gladly allowed the workers and peasants to fight singlehanded, at their own risk, but always took measures to prevent the

victorious workers and peasants from enjoying the fruits of their victory and assuming power themselves. We did not think that the Central Executive Committee would completely disgrace itself by following the example of the bourgeoisie in this respect. . . .

Quite naturally, a number of workers' and soldiers' local organisations, in the rear and at the front, in Central Russia and Kharkov, in the Donets Basin and Siberia, in Samara and Dvinsk, vehemently protested against this outrageous violation of the rights of the revolution.

But, we repeat, we shall not stop to discuss this. Let us pass to the chief point.

The conference has been convened to define the conditions necessary for the "organisation of the revolutionary power."

Well, then, how is power to be organised?

Undoubtedly, you can only organise what you possess—you can't organise power when it is in the hands of others. A conference that undertakes to organise power which it does not possess, power which is concentrated in the hands of Kerensky, and which Kerensky has once already launched against the "Soviets and the Bolsheviks" in Petrograd—such a conference must find itself in the most idiotic predicament at the first attempt it makes to pass from word to deed.

For one thing or the other:

Either the conference really does "take" power, come what may—in which case it can, and must, discuss the organisation of the revolutionary power it has won.

Or the conference does not "take" power, does not break with Kerensky—in which case discussing the organ-

isation of power must inevitably degenerate into empty prattling.

But let us assume—let us assume for a moment—that by some miracle power has been taken and all that remains is to organise it. Well, then, how is it to be organised? On what basis is it to be constructed?

"On the basis of a coalition with the bourgeoisie!" answer the Avksentyevs and Tseretelis in chorus.

"Without a coalition with the bourgeoisie there can be no salvation!" cry *Dyen*, *Volya Naroda* and the other echoers of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

But we have already had six months of coalition with the bourgeoisie. What has it given us, except greater disruption and the torments of hunger, prolongation of the war and economic disintegration, four crises of power and the Kornilov revolt, exhaustion of the country and financial subjection to the West?

Is that not enough for Messieurs the compromisers?

They talk about the strength and might of coalition, about "broadening the basis" of the revolution and so on. But why did the coalition with the bourgeoisie, the coalition with the Cadets, vanish like smoke at the first breath of the Kornilov revolt? Did not the Cadets desert the government? Where, then, does the "strength" of coalition and "broadening the basis" of the revolution come in?

Will Messieurs the compromisers ever realise that it is impossible to "save the revolution" by an alliance with deserters?

Who was it that upheld the revolution and its conquests at the time of the Kornilov revolt?

Was it, perhaps, the "bourgeois liberals"? But they were in one camp with the Kornilovites against the

revolution and its Committees. Milyukov and Maklakov are now saying so openly.

Or was it the "merchant and industrial classes"? But they, too, at that time were in one camp with Kornilov. Guchkov, Ryabushinsky and the other "public men" who were at Kornilov's headquarters now say so openly.

Will Messieurs the compromisers ever realise that coalition with the bourgeoisie means an alliance with the Kornilovs and Lukomskys?

People are talking about the growing disruption of industry, and facts are cited which convict the lockout capitalists of deliberately curtailing production. . . . People are talking about the shortage of raw materials, and facts are cited which convict the profiteering merchants of concealing cotton, coal, etc. . . . People are talking about the starvation in the cities, and facts are cited which convict the speculating banks of artificially holding back supplies of grain. . . . Will Messieurs the compromisers ever realise that coalition with the bourgeoisie, coalition with the propertied elements, means an alliance with swindlers and profiteers, an alliance with marauders and lockout capitalists?

Is it not self-evident that only by combating the landlords and capitalists, only by combating the imperialists of all brands, only by combating and vanquishing them, can the country be saved from starvation and disruption, from economic exhaustion and financial bankruptcy, from disintegration and degeneration?

And since the Soviets and Committees have proved to be the main bulwarks of the revolution, since the Soviets and Committees quelled the counter-revolutionary revolt, is it not obvious that they, and they alone, should

now be the chief repositories of revolutionary power in the country?

How is the revolutionary power to be organised, you ask?

But it is already being organised—apart from the conference and perhaps in defiance of the conference—in the course of the struggle against counter-revolution, on the basis of an actual break with the bourgeoisie and in a fight against the bourgeoisie. It is being organised from revolutionary workers, peasants and soldiers.

The elements of this power are the revolutionary Committees and Soviets in the rear and at the front.

The embryo of this power is that Left wing which, presumably, will take shape at the conference.

The conference will have to sanction and complete this process of establishing a revolutionary power, or else put itself at the mercy of Kerensky and depart from the scene.

The Central Executive Committee already attempted to take the revolutionary road yesterday by rejecting a coalition with the Cadets.

But the Cadets are the only bourgeois party of weight. Will Messieurs the compromisers realise that there are no other bourgeois circles with which to form a coalition?

Will they have the courage to make the choice?

We shall see.

Rabochy Put, No. 10,
September 14, 1917

Editorial

TWO LINES

The fundamental question of a revolution is the question of power. The character of a revolution, its course and outcome wholly depend upon who wields power, upon which class is in power. What is called a crisis of power is nothing but an outward manifestation of a struggle of classes for power. A revolutionary epoch, indeed, is remarkable for the fact that in it the struggle for power assumes its most acute and naked form. That explains our "chronic" crisis of power, which is being still further aggravated by war, disruption and famine. That explains the "astonishing" fact that not a single "conference" or "congress" can be held nowadays without the question of power inevitably arising.

And it arose, inevitably, at the Democratic Conference in the Alexandrinsky Theatre.

Two lines on the question of power have been revealed at the conference.

The first line is that of open coalition with the Cadet Party. It is advocated by the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary defencists. It was urged at the conference by that inveterate compromiser, Tsereteli.

The second line is that of a radical break with the Cadet Party. It is advocated by our Party and the internationalists in the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties. It was urged at the conference by Kamenev.

The first line leads to the establishment of the power of the imperialist bourgeoisie over the people. For our experience of coalition governments has shown that coalition with the Cadets means the rule of the landlord over the peasant who is not being given land; the rule of the capitalist over the worker who is being doomed to unemployment; the rule of a minority over the majority, which is being condemned to be devoured by war and economic disruption, starvation and ruin.

The second line leads to the establishment of the power of the people over the landlords and capitalists. For breaking with the Cadet Party in fact means ensuring land to the peasants, control to the workers, and a just peace to the toiling majority.

The first line is an expression of confidence in the present government, and would leave the entire power in its hands.

The second line is an expression of no confidence in the government, and calls for the transfer of power to the direct representatives of the workers', peasants', and soldiers' Soviets.

There are people who dream of reconciling these two irreconcilable lines. One of them is Chernov, who at the conference came out against the Cadets, but in favour of a coalition with the capitalists, if (!) the capitalists renounced (!) their own interests.

The intrinsic falsity of Chernov's "position" is self-evident; but the important thing is not that it is self-contradictory, but that it surreptitiously smuggles in Tsereteli's rubbish about coalition with the Cadet Party.

For it would give Kerensky a free hand, "acting on the platform of the conference," to "enlarge" the government with diverse Buryshkins and Kishkins, who are prepared to put their name to any platform without any intention of carrying it out.

For this false "position" would help Kerensky in his fight against the Soviets and Committees by placing a weapon in his hand in the shape of an advisory "Pre-parliament."

Chernov's "line" is the same line as Tsereteli's, only "cunningly" masked in order to ensnare simpletons in the "coalition" trap.

There are grounds for believing that the conference will follow Chernov's lead.

But the conference is not the court of highest instance.

The two lines we have described only reflect what exists in actual fact. And in actual fact we have not one power, but two: the official power, the Directory, and the unofficial power, the Soviets and Committees.

The struggle between these two powers—although still muffled and unrealised—is the characteristic feature of the moment.

The conference is evidently intended to be the make-weight which will tip the scales in favour of the power of the Directory.

But let Messieurs the compromisers, overt and covert, know that whoever supports the Directory helps to

establish the power of the bourgeoisie and must inevitably come into conflict with the worker and soldier masses, must come out in opposition to the Soviets and Committees.

Messieurs the compromisers cannot but know that it is the revolutionary Committees and Soviets that will have the last word.

Rabochy Put, No. 12,
September 16, 1917

Editorial

ALL POWER TO THE SOVIETS!

The revolution is marching on. Fired upon in the July days and "buried" at the Moscow Conference, it is rising again, breaking down the old barriers and creating a new power. The first line of counter-revolutionary trenches has been captured. After Kornilov, Kaledin too is retreating. In the fire of battle the almost defunct Soviets are reviving. They are taking their place at the helm again and leading the revolutionary masses.

All power to the Soviets!—such is the slogan of the new movement.

The Kerensky government is taking up arms against the new movement. At the very start of the Kornilov revolt it threatened to dissolve the revolutionary Committees and qualified the fight against Kornilovism as "usurpation of authority." Since then the fight against the Committees has grown steadily fiercer and has now passed into open war.

The Simferopol Soviet arrests one of the Kornilov conspirators, the not unnotorious Ryabushinsky. And in retaliation, the Kerensky government orders that "measures be taken to release Ryabushinsky and that the persons responsible for his illegal arrest be brought to account" (*Rech*).

In Tashkent all authority passes to the Soviet and the old authorities are deposed. And, in retaliation, the Kerensky government "is adopting a number of measures, which are being kept secret for the present, but which should have a most sobering effect on the presumptuous leaders of the Tashkent Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" (*Russkiye Vedomosti*).

The Soviets demand a strict and thorough investigation of the affair of Kornilov and his accomplices. And, in retaliation, the Kerensky government is "narrowing down the investigation to an insignificant circle of individuals, and is ignoring certain very important evidence which would furnish grounds for qualifying Kornilov's crime as betrayal of the country, and not only as a revolt" (Shubnikov's report, *Novaya Zhizn*).

The Soviets demand a break with the bourgeoisie and primarily with the Cadets. And, in retaliation, the Kerensky government negotiates with the Kishkins and Konovalovs, invites them into the government and proclaims the government's "independence" of the Soviets.

All power to the imperialist bourgeoisie!—such is the slogan of the Kerensky government.

There is no room for doubt. What we have is two powers: the power of Kerensky and his government, and the power of the Soviets and Committees.

It is a struggle between these two powers which is the characteristic feature of the present moment.

Either the power of the Kerensky government—which means the rule of the landlords and capitalists, war and economic disruption.

Or the power of the Soviets—which will mean the rule of the workers and peasants, peace and an end to the economic disruption.

That is the way, and the only way, that the question is posed by the realities of the situation.

This question was raised by the revolution at each crisis of power. And every time Messieurs the compromisers evaded a straight answer, and, by evading it, surrendered the power to the enemy. By convening a conference instead of a Congress of Soviets, the compromisers wanted again to evade it and surrender the power to the bourgeoisie. But they have miscalculated. A time has come when evasion is no longer possible.

The straight question posed by the realities demands a clear and definite answer.

For the Soviets, or against them?

Let Messieurs the compromisers choose.

Rabochy Put, No. 13,
September 17, 1917

Editorial

THE REVOLUTIONARY FRONT

The Socialist-Revolutionaries of *Delo Naroda* are displeased with the Bolsheviks. They abuse the Bolsheviks, they slander the Bolsheviks, they even threaten the Bolsheviks. For what? For their "unrestrained demagogy," their "factional sectarianism," their "schismatic activity," their lack of "revolutionary discipline." In brief, for the fact that the Bolsheviks are opposed to unity with the Socialist-Revolutionaries of *Delo Naroda*.

Unity with the Socialist-Revolutionaries of *Delo Naroda*! . . . But, frankly, is such unity possible now?

At a time when the Democratic Conference in Petrograd is exhausting itself in futile debates and its initiators are hastily elaborating formulas for the "salvation" of the revolution, while the Kerensky government, with the encouragement of Buchanan and Milyukov, continues to go "its own" way, a decisive process is taking place in Russia—the growth of a new power, a genuinely popular and genuinely revolutionary power, which is waging a desperate struggle for existence. On the one hand there are the Soviets, which stand at the head of the revolution, at the head of the fight against counter-revolution, which is not yet smashed, which has

only retreated, and is wisely hiding behind the back of the government. On the other hand there is the Kerensky government, which is shielding the counter-revolutionaries, is coming to terms with the Kornilovites (the Cadets!), has declared war on the Soviets, and is trying to crush them in order not to be crushed itself.

Who will triumph in this struggle? That is the whole point just now.

Either the Soviets have the power—and that will mean the victory of the revolution and a just peace.

Or the Kerensky government has the power—which will mean the victory of the counter-revolution and "war to a finish"—the finish of Russia.

The conference, without deciding the issue, is only reflecting this struggle, and, of course, very belatedly.

That is why the main thing now is not to elaborate general formulas for the "salvation" of the revolution, but to give direct support to the Soviets in their struggle against the Kerensky government.

You want a united revolutionary front? Well, then, support the Soviets, break with the Kerensky government, and unity will come of itself. A united front is formed not as a result of debates, but in the process of struggle.

The Soviets demand the dismissal of the Cadet commissars. But the Kerensky government is foisting these unwanted commissars upon them and is threatening to resort to force. . . .

On whose side are you, citizens of *Delo Naroda*? On the side of the Soviets or of Kerensky's commissars?

In Tashkent the Soviet, in which the Socialist-Revolutionaries constitute the majority, has taken over

power and dismissed the old officials. But the Kerensky government is sending a punitive expedition to Tashkent and is demanding the restoration of the old authority, "punishment" of the Soviet and so on. . . .

On whose side are you, citizens of *Delo Naroda*? On the side of the Tashkent Soviet or of Kerensky's punitive expedition?

There is no reply. For we have not heard of a single protest, of a single act of opposition on the part of the followers of *Delo Naroda* to these counter-revolutionary exercises of Mr. Kerensky.

It is incredible, but a fact. Petrograd Socialist-Revolutionary Kerensky, seated in his Directory, arms himself with "machine guns" and marches against the Socialist-Revolutionaries in the Tashkent Soviet, yet *Delo Naroda*, central organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, maintains a profound silence, as though it were none of its business! Socialist-Revolutionary Kerensky prepares to engage in a knifing match with the Socialist-Revolutionaries of Tashkent, yet *Delo Naroda* publishes Kerensky's ferocious "order" without even thinking it necessary to comment on it, evidently determined to observe "neutrality"!

But what sort of party is this, whose members can go to the extent of slaughtering one another with the open connivance of its central organ?

There must be a united revolutionary front, we are told. But unity with whom?

With the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which has no opinion of its own, for it remains silent?

With the Kerensky group, which is preparing to smash the Soviets?

Or with the Tashkent group of Socialist-Revolutionaries, who are creating a new power for the sake of the revolution and its conquests?

We are prepared to support the Tashkent Soviet; we shall fight in the same ranks as the revolutionary Socialist-Revolutionaries; with them we shall have a united front.

But will the citizens of *Delo Naroda* ever understand that it is impossible to support both the Tashkent group and Kerensky simultaneously? For whoever supports the Tashkent group must break with Kerensky.

Will they ever understand that in not breaking with the Kerensky government and in observing "neutrality" they are betraying the cause of their Tashkent comrades?

Will they ever understand that before demanding a united front with the Bolsheviks they must first establish unity in their own house, in their own party, by definitely breaking *either* with Kerensky, *or* with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries?

You want a united front with the Bolsheviks? Then break with the Kerensky government, support the Soviets in their struggle for power, and there will be unity.

Why was unity established so easily and simply in the days of the Kornilov revolt?

Because then it arose not as a result of endless debates, but in the course of a direct struggle against counter-revolution.

The counter-revolution is not yet crushed. It has only retreated and is hiding behind the Kerensky government. The revolution must capture this second line of trenches of the counter-revolution also, if it wants to be victorious. And the culmination of this victory will

be precisely the success of the Soviets in their struggle for power. He who does not want to find himself "on the other side of the barricades," he who does not want to come under the fire of the Soviets, he who wants the victory of the revolution, must break with the Kerensky government and support the struggle of the Soviets.

You want a united revolutionary front?

Then support the Soviets against the Directory, support the struggle against the counter-revolution resolutely and unreservedly—do this, and unity will be achieved as a matter of course, simply and naturally, as was the case during the Kornilov revolt.

With the Soviets or against them? Choose, citizens of *Delo Naroda.*

Rabochy Put, No. 14,
September 19, 1917

Editorial

FORGING CHAINS

The machinery of compromise has been set in motion. That political house of assignation, the Winter Palace, is full of clients. Whom do we not find there! Just take a look at them, the honoured guests—Moscow Kornilovites and Petrograd Savinkovites; Nabokov the Kornilovite "Minister" and Tsereteli the champion disarmer; Kishkin the sworn enemy of the Soviets and Konovalov the notorious lockout expert; representatives of the party of political deserters (the Cadets!) and co-operator bigwigs of the Berkenheim breed; representatives of the punitive expedition party (the Socialist-Revolutionaries!) and Right-wing Zemstvoists of the Dushechkin type; political pimps of the Directory and well-known plutocrats of the "public man" category.

Cadets and industrialists, on the one hand.

Defencists and co-operators, on the other.

On the one side, the industrialists as the prop, and the Cadets as the army.

On the other, the co-operators as the prop, and the defencists as the army; for after the defencists lost the Soviets they had to retire to their old positions, to the co-operators.

"Cast off the Bolsheviks," and "the bourgeoisie and the democracy will then have a common front," says Kishkin to the defencists.

"Glad to be of service," replies Avksentyev, "but let us first establish a 'statesmanlike approach.'"

"The bourgeoisie no less than the democracy should reckon with the growth of Bolshevism and endeavour to form a coalition government," Berkenheim admonishes Avksentyev.

"Glad to be of service," Avksentyev replies.

Do you hear: a coalition government is needed, it appears, for the purpose of fighting Bolshevism, that is, the Soviets, that is, the workers and soldiers!

"The Pre-parliament must be an 'advisory body,' and the government must be 'independent' of it," says Nabokov.

"Glad to be of service," replies Tsereteli, because he agrees that "the Provisional Government should not be formally . . . responsible to the Pre-parliament" (*Rech*).

It is not the Pre-parliament that must set up the government but, on the contrary, the government must set up the Pre-parliament and "announce its composition, terms of reference and standing orders," says the Cadet declaration.

"Agreed," replies Tsereteli, "the government must sanction this institution" (*Novaya Zhizn*) and determine "its structure" (*Rech*).

And that honest broker from the Winter Palace, Mr. Kerensky, authoritatively proclaims:

1) "The right to form the government and appoint its members now belongs solely to the Provisional Government."

2) "This conference (the Pre-parliament) cannot have the functions and rights of a parliament."

3) "The Provisional Government cannot be responsible to this conference" (*Rech*).

In short, Kerensky "fully agrees" with the Cadets, and the defencists are glad to be of service. What more do you want?

It was not for nothing that Prokopovich said on leaving the Winter Palace: "It may be taken that agreement has been reached."

It is true that only yesterday the conference declared against coalition with the Cadets. But what do the inveterate compromisers care about that? Seeing that they had decided to counterfeit the will of the revolutionary democracy by convening a conference instead of a Congress of Soviets, why should they not counterfeit the will of the conference itself? It is only the first step that's hard.

It is true that only yesterday the conference passed a resolution to the effect that the Pre-parliament was to "set up" the government and that the latter was to be "responsible" to it. But what do the inveterate compromisers care about that, as long as coalition flourishes—and as for the decisions of the conference, of what use are they when they militate against coalition?

Poor "Democratic Conference"!

Poor naive and trusting delegates!

Could they have anticipated that their leaders would go to the length of downright treachery?

Our Party was right when it asserted that the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who derive their strength not from the revolutionary move-

ment of the masses but from compromise arrangements of bourgeois politicians, are incapable of pursuing an independent policy.

Our Party was right when it said that a policy of compromise must lead to betrayal of the interests of the revolution.

Everyone now realises that those political bankrupts, the defencists, are forging chains for the peoples of Russia with their own hands, to the glee of the enemies of the revolution.

It is not for nothing that the Cadets feel satisfied and are rubbing their hands in anticipation of victory.

It is not for nothing that Messieurs the compromisers are slouching around "like whipped curs" with a guilty look on their faces.

It is not for nothing that a note of victory is to be heard in Kerensky's declarations.

Yes, they are jubilant.

But insecure is their "victory" and transient their jubilation, for they are reckoning without their host, the people.

For the hour is near when the deceived workers and soldiers will at last utter their weighty word and upset their spurious "victory" like a house of cards.

And then Messieurs the compromisers will have only themselves to blame if with the rest of the coalition junk, their own defencist lumber is sent flying.

Rabochy Put, No. 19,
September 24, 1917

Editorial

A GOVERNMENT OF BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP

After the fake conference and the disgraceful collapse of the government, after the "conversations" with the Moscow stockbrokers and the mysterious visits to Sir George Buchanan, after the lovers' meetings at the Winter Palace and a series of treacheries on the part of the compromisers, a "new" (brand new!) government has at last been formed.

Six capitalist Ministers as the core of the "cabinet" with ten "socialist" Ministers to serve them as executants of their will.

The government has not yet issued its declaration, but what its main planks will be is known: "measures against anarchy" (read: against the Soviets!), "measures against economic disruption" (read: against strikes!), "improvement of the fighting efficiency of the army" (read: continuation of the war, and "discipline"!).

This, in general, is the "programme" of the Kerensky-Konovalov government.

What it means is that the peasants will not get land, the workers will not get control of industry, and Russia will not get peace.

The Kerensky-Konovalov government is a government of war and bourgeois dictatorship.

The ten "socialist" Ministers are a screen behind which the imperialist bourgeoisie will work to strengthen its rule over the workers, peasants and soldiers.

What Kornilov wanted to achieve with the bluntness and simpleness of a general, the "new" government will endeavour to achieve gradually and inconspicuously by the hand of the "Socialists" themselves.

What distinguishes the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie from the dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry?

The fact that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is the rule of a minority over the majority, exercised solely by coercing the majority and calling for civil war against the majority. The dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry, on the other hand, is the rule of the majority over the minority, and can therefore dispense with civil war altogether. But it follows from this that the policy of the "new" government will be a policy of provoking unsuccessful partial actions, in order to incite the soldiers against the workers, or the front against the rear, and drown the might of the revolution in blood.

The fact also that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a secret, concealed, backstage dictatorship, which needs a plausible camouflage with which to deceive the masses. The dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry, on the other hand, is an open dictatorship, a dictatorship of the masses, which has no need to resort to deception in home affairs or to secret diplomacy in foreign affairs. But it follows that our bourgeois dictators will strive to solve the most vital problems of the country, the question of war and

peace, for example, behind the back of the masses, without the masses, by means of a conspiracy against the masses.

We have clear evidence of this in the very first steps of the Kerensky-Konovalov government. Judge for yourselves. The key posts in foreign affairs have been entrusted to leading Cadet Kornilovites. Tereshchenko gets the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nabokov the embassy in London, Maklakov the embassy in Paris, Yefremov the embassy in Berne, where a (preliminary!) international peace conference is now gathering. And these people, who have no connection with the masses, who are open enemies of the masses, will decide the question of war and peace, in which the lives of millions of soldiers are at stake!

Or again: according to the newspapers, "Kerensky, Tereshchenko, Verkhovsky and Verderevsky are today leaving for General Headquarters," where "besides a discussion of the general situation at the front in which Tereshchenko will participate, there will be a conference of the foreign military agents attached to General Headquarters" (*Birzhovka*, evening edition). . . . And all that as a preliminary to an Allied conference, to which the celebrated Tsereteli is being taken in the capacity of Mr. Tereshchenko's Sancho Panza. What can these loyal servitors of imperialism have to whisper about, if not the interests of the imperialists, home and Allied? And what can their clandestine discussions of peace and war amount to, if not to a conspiracy against the interests of the people?

Doubt is out of the question. The Kerensky-Konovalov government is a government of the dictatorship of

the imperialist bourgeoisie. Its home policy is provocation of civil war. Its foreign policy is a clandestine settlement of the question of war and peace. Its aim is to consolidate the rule of a minority over the majority of the population of Russia.

It is the task of the proletariat, as the leader of the Russian revolution, to tear the mask from this government and expose its true counter-revolutionary face to the masses. It is the task of the proletariat to rally around itself the soldier and peasant masses and to restrain them from premature action. It is the task of the proletariat to close its ranks and prepare tirelessly for the impending battles.

The workers and soldiers in the capital have already taken the first step by passing a vote of no confidence in the Kerensky-Konovalov government and by calling upon the masses "to rally around their Soviets and to refrain from partial actions" (see the resolution of the Petrograd Soviet[79]).

It is now for the provinces to say their word.

Rabochy Put, No. 21,
September 27, 1917

Editorial

COMMENTS

THE RAILWAY STRIKE AND THE DEMOCRATIC BANKRUPTS

The grandly conceived and magnificently organised railway strike[80] is apparently coming to an end. The victory is with the railwaymen, because it is self-evident that the puny coalition of the Kornilov-defencist camp is incapable of withstanding the mighty onslaught of the entire democracy of the country. It is now clear to all that the strike was "instigated" not by the malicious intent of the railwaymen, but by the anti-revolutionary policy of the Directory. It is now clear to all that the strike was forced on the country not by the Railwaymen's Committees, but by the counter-revolutionary threats of Kerensky and Nikitin. It is now clear to all that the failure of the strike would have led to the certain militarisation of the railways and . . . the consolidation of the power of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The railwaymen were right in retorting to the despicable calumnies of Kerensky and Nikitin with the damning accusation:

"It is not we, citizens Kerensky and Nikitin, who have betrayed the country, *but you who have betrayed your ideals, and the Provisional Government which has betrayed its promises.* This time no words or threats can stop us."

All this, we repeat, is clear and generally known.

Yet, it appears, there are men calling themselves democrats who nevertheless think it permissible at this grave moment to throw stones at the railwaymen, not realising, or not desiring to realise, that they are thereby bringing grist to the mill of the cannibals of *Rech* and *Novoye Vremya*.

We are referring to the editorial board of the Menshevik *Rabochaya Gazeta*.

Accusing the strike leaders of having "bent to the forces of chaos" in declaring the strike, the paper menacingly declares:

> "The democracy *will not forgive* the railwaymen's general staff for this. The interests of the whole country, of the entire democracy, cannot be staked so lightly" (*Rabochaya Gazeta*, No. 170).

It is incredible, but a fact: a shabby sheet, which has not a trace of democracy in it, considers itself entitled to hurl threats at the genuine democracy, the toilers of the railways.

"The democracy will not forgive.". . . But in the name of which democracy are you speaking, gentlemen of *Rabochaya Gazeta*?

Is it in the name of the democracy of the Soviets, which turned its back on you, and whose will you faked at the conference?

But who gave you the right to speak in the name of *that* democracy?

Or are you speaking in the name of Tsereteli, Dan, Lieber and the other counterfeiters who faked the will of the Soviets at the conference and betrayed the conference itself at the "negotiations" in the Winter Palace?

But who gave you the right to identify these betrayers of democracy with "the democracy of the entire country"?

Will you ever realise that the way of *Rabochaya Gazeta* and the way of "the democracy of the entire country" have irrevocably parted?

Wretched democratic bankrupts! . . .

* * *

THE RUSSIAN PEASANTS AND THE PARTY OF NUMSKULLS

Not so long ago we wrote that in the Socialist-Revolutionary Party there was no consensus of opinion on the basic issue—the struggle between the government and the Soviets. Whereas the Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries urged the disbandment of the "anarchistic" Soviets (remember Tashkent!) and organised punitive expeditions, and the Left wing supported the Soviets, the Chernov Centre was afflicted with Hamlet-like doubts, had no opinion of its own, and preferred to observe "neutrality." True, the Centre subsequently "recovered its wits," recalled the members of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party from the Tashkent Soviet, and thereby supported the punitive expedition policy. But who does not know now that this recall only exposed the disgrace of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, because the Socialist-Revolutionaries did not leave the Tashkent Soviet, and it was not the Soviet, but the Kerensky government and its underlings who proved to be guilty of "counter-revolutionary actions"? . . .

But hardly had the Socialist-Revolutionaries extricated themselves from this "business," when they found

themselves involved in another and even viler "business." We are referring to the way they voted on the land question in the so-called Pre-parliament.

In the course of the debate in the Pre-parliament on the Declaration of August 14,[81] the Left-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries moved that all the landed estates be placed under the management of the Peasant Committees. Need it be said that it is the duty of democrats to support this proposal? Need it be said either that the question of the land is a fundamental issue of our revolution? And what do we find? Whereas the Bolsheviks and the Left-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries proposed that the land should be transferred to the peasants, and the Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries and Lieberdanists[82] opposed this proposal, the Chernov Centre again proved to be without "its own opinion" and *abstained* from voting!

Chernov, the "Muzhik Minister," did not venture to come out in support of the transfer of the landed estates to the peasants, leaving the question to be decided by the fakers of the will of the peasants!

At a critical moment of the Russian revolution the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the party of "agrarian revolution" and "integral socialism," proved to have no definite opinion on the fundamental question of the peasants!

Verily, a party of prating numskulls!

Poor Russian peasants. . . .

Rabochy Put, No. 21,
September 27, 1917

Unsigned

CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE WORKERS

A week ago the bourgeois press started a witch-hunt against the Donets Basin workers. There was no fantastic charge the corrupt bourgeois papers did not level against them—they accused them of "anarchy," of "wrecking plants," of "arresting and beating up" office personnel! Already then it could be foreseen that a campaign against the Donets workers was being planned, and that the government was paving the way for it. And, sure enough, the government "did not remain deaf" to the howls of the hirelings of the bourgeoisie. That is what a government of bourgeois dictatorship is for. It was reported in the press that the Provisional Government's Chief Economic Committee, with the "benevolent acquiescence" of Kerensky, of course, "deemed it expedient to dispatch to Kharkov and the Donets Basin . . . a person vested with *dictatorial* powers. This person is to be instructed to induce the manufacturers to continue operation and to bring influence to bear on the working masses with a view to their pacification. All means of coercion at the disposal of the government authorities are to be placed at the command of this person" (*Torgovo-Promyshlennaya Gazeta*,[83] September 26).

Mark: a "dictator" with "means of coercion." . . . Against whom is this still anonymous "dictator" being dispatched? Is it against the Donets employers, who for three months now have been deliberately curtailing production and criminally swelling unemployment, and are now openly and publicly organising lockouts and threatening the disruption of the economic life of the country?

Of course, not!

The Chief Economic Committee bluntly says that the whole trouble lies with "malicious agitators," and not the employers, for, "According to available information, the excesses have been provoked by groups of malicious agitators" (*ibid.*).

It is against them, in the first place, that the "dictator" with his "means of coercion" is being dispatched.

Nor is that all. According to *Birzhovka*, the Kharkov Conference of Manufacturers has resolved:

1) That "hiring and discharge of office personnel and workers is the exclusive right of the owners."

2) That "interference by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in the management and control of production is impermissible."

3) That "the owners cannot bear the expense of maintenance and payment of the members of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, executive committees or trade unions."

4) That "no wage increases can improve the lot of the workers" (*Birzheviye Vedomosti*, September 27).

In brief, the manufacturers are declaring war on the workers and their organisations.

It need scarcely be said that lockout-man Konovalov's government will not fail to take the lead in this war on the workers.

And since the workers will not surrender without a fight, a "dictator" with "means of coercion" is needed.

That's the whole secret.

Savinkov was called a counter-revolutionary for having drafted a bill for the militarisation of enterprises working for defence.

Kornilov was accused of treason for having demanded the enactment of that bill.

What shall we call a government which "without wasting words" sends to the Donets Basin a "dictator" with unlimited powers and armed with "all means of coercion" to wage war on the working masses and to smash their organisations?

What have Messieurs the "socialist" Ministers to say to this?

Rabochy Put, No. 22,
September 28, 1917

Unsigned

YOU WILL WAIT IN VAIN!

The outstanding feature of the present moment is the impassable chasm that lies between the government and the mass of the people, a chasm which did not exist in the early months of the revolution, and which opened as a result of the Kornilov revolt.

After the victory over tsarism, at the very beginning of the revolution, power came into the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It was not the workers and soldiers, but a handful of Cadet imperialists who came to power. How did that happen, and what precisely did the rule of this handful of bourgeois rest on? The fact of the matter was that the workers and, chiefly, the soldiers placed their trust in the bourgeoisie and hoped, in alliance with it, to secure bread and land, peace and freedom. It was on this "unreasoning trust" of the masses in the bourgeoisie that the rule of the bourgeoisie then rested. The coalition with the bourgeoisie was merely the expression of this trust and this rule.

But six months of revolution have not been in vain. What the coalition with the bourgeoisie has given the masses is starvation instead of bread, unemployment instead of higher wages, empty promises instead of

land, a fight against the Soviets instead of liberty, war until the exhaustion of Russia and the treachery of the Kornilovites at Tarnopol and Riga instead of peace. The Kornilov revolt merely summed up the six months' experience of coalition by revealing the treachery of the Cadets and the disastrousness of a policy of compromise with them.

All that, of course, has not been in vain. The "unreasoning trust" of the masses in the bourgeoisie has disappeared. Coalition with the Cadets has been succeeded by a break with them. Confidence in the bourgeoisie has been succeeded by hatred for it. The rule of the bourgeoisie no longer has a reliable foundation.

It is true that with the help of the compromise devices of the defencists, with the help of fake and forgery, with the assistance of Buchanan and the Cadet Kornilovites, and in the face of the manifest distrust of the workers and soldiers, the compromisers have nevertheless succeeded in knocking together a "new" government of the old bourgeois dictatorship by fraudulently restoring the obsolete and dilapidated coalition.

But, in the first place, this coalition is anemic, for, engineered in the Winter Palace, it is meeting with resistance and indignation in the country.

In the second place, this government is unstable, for it has no firm ground under its feet in the shape of the confidence and sympathy of the masses, who feel nothing but hatred for it.

Hence the impassable chasm that lies between the government and the country.

And if this government remains in power nevertheless, if, in obedience to the will of a minority, it intends

to rule over an obviously hostile majority, it is clear that it can be relying on one thing only—the use of violence against the masses. Such a government can have no other backing.

It is therefore no chance thing that the first step of the Kerensky-Konovalov government was to disperse the Tashkent Soviet.

Nor is it a chance thing that this government has already set out to suppress the workers' movement in the Donets Basin, and has sent a mysterious "dictator" there.

Nor is it a chance thing either that at its meeting yesterday it declared war on peasant "unrest" by resolving:

> "to set up local committees of the Provisional Government, the direct function of which shall be to combat anarchy and to put down disorders" (*Birzhovka*).

None of these are chance things.

Deprived of the confidence of the masses, but desiring to remain in power nevertheless, the government of bourgeois dictatorship cannot exist without "anarchy" and "disorders," for it is by combating them that it can justify its existence. Its one dream is that the Bolsheviks "organise a revolt," or that the peasants "wreck" landed estates, or that the railwaymen "foist a disastrous strike on the country" which interrupts the supply of food to the front. . . . It "needs" all this in order to incite the peasants against the workers, the front against the rear, thus creating the need for armed intervention and enabling it to strengthen its insecure position for a time.

For it must be understood at last that, lacking the confidence of the country and surrounded by the hatred of the masses, this government can be nothing else than a *government for the provocation of "civil war."*

It is not for nothing that *Rech*, the semi-official organ of the Provisional Government, warns the government against "giving the Bolsheviks the opportunity of choosing the moment for declaring civil war," and advises it not to "wait in patience until they (the Bolsheviks) choose a convenient moment for a general offensive" (*Rech*, Wednesday).

Yes, they are thirsting for the blood of the people. . . .

But their hopes are vain and their efforts ridiculous.

Consciously and in organised fashion, the revolutionary proletariat is marching to victory. Unanimously and confidently the peasants and soldiers are rallying behind it. Ever louder rings the cry: "All power to the Soviets!"

Can the paper coalition in the Winter Palace . . . withstand this pressure?

You want disunited and premature Bolshevik actions?

You will wait in vain, Messieurs the Kornilovites.

Rabochy Put, No. 23,
September 29, 1917

Editorial

COMMENTS

THE PARTY OF "INDETERMINATES" AND THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS

In the days of tsarism the Socialist-Revolutionary Party used to cry from the housetops that the landed estates must be turned over to the peasants. The peasants believed the Socialist-Revolutionaries and rallied to them, regarding them as their party, the party of the peasants.

With the fall of tsarism and the victory of the revolution, the time at last came for the Socialist-Revolutionaries to pass from word to deed and to carry out their "golden promises" of land. But . . . (that famous "but"!) the Socialist-Revolutionaries vacillated and stammeringly suggested to the peasants that they put off the land question until the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, the convocation of which, moreover, was postponed.

It appeared that it was easier to rant about the land and the peasants than actually to turn over the land to the peasants. It appeared that the Socialist-Revolutionaries had only professed to "commiserate" with the peasants, and that when the time came to pass from

word to deed, they preferred to back out and hide behind the Constituent Assembly....

The peasants retorted to this with a powerful agrarian movement, unauthorised "seizure" of landed estates and "appropriation" of farm stock and implements, thereby expressing their lack of confidence in the Socialist-Revolutionaries' policy of temporising.

The Socialist-Revolutionary Ministers were not slow to retaliate, and they arrested scores and hundreds of peasants, members of the Land Committees. And so we got a picture of Socialist-Revolutionary Ministers arresting Socialist-Revolutionary peasants for carrying out Socialist-Revolutionary promises.

The upshot is the complete disintegration of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, a disintegration most vividly manifested in the voting in the Pre-parliament, when the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries came out *for*, and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries *against*, the immediate transfer of the land to the peasants, while Chernov, that Hamlet of the party, and the Centre judiciously *abstained* from voting.

The reply was a mass exodus of soldiers from the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.

Now one section of the soldiers, who have not yet left the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, emphatically "urge the Central Committee of the Party" to bring about unity in the party by putting an end to the "indeterminateness."

Listen to this:

"This joint conference of representatives of the army organisations of the regiments and special units of Petrograd, Tsarskoye Selo, Peterhof, etc., considering it necessary at this grave moment

for the Party to cement its majority . . . on the basis of a programme which would put an end to the Party's indeterminateness and unite all its virile elements . . . declares in favour of . . . the immediate transfer of all arable land to the Land Committees. . ." (*Delo Naroda*).

And so, the question of the "*immediate* transfer of the land" is raised again!

On the basis of the recognition of this demand the soldiers hope to unite all the "virile elements" in the Socialist-Revolutionary Party!

Naive innocents! After a series of failures, they again want to harness Kamkov the revolutionary, Avksentyev the Cadet and Chernov the "indeterminate" to one cart!

It is high time to realise, comrade soldiers, that the Socialist-Revolutionary Party no longer exists, that there is only an "indeterminate" mass, one section of which has got entangled in Savinkovism, another has remained within the revolutionary ranks, while a third is hopelessly at a standstill and in practice is serving as a shield for the Savinkovites.

It is high time to realise that and to abandon all attempts to unite the ununitable. . . .

* * *

CONSPIRATORS IN POWER

Burtsev writes today in his newspaper *Obshcheye Delo*[84]:

"It may now be quite confidently affirmed that there was no Kornilov conspiracy! Actually there was something quite different: *a compact between the government and General Kornilov to*

fight the Bolsheviks! That which the government's representatives were negotiating with General Kornilov—a fight against the Bolsheviks—had been the cherished dream of representatives of various parties, both democratic and socialist. Right down to that unhappy day of August 26, they all looked upon General Kornilov as their saviour from the impending Bolshevik menace."

Not a "conspiracy," but a "compact"—writes Burtsev in italics.

He is right. In this instance he is undoubtedly right. A compact was concluded to organise a conspiracy against the Bolsheviks, that is, against the working class, against the revolutionary army and the peasantry. It was *a compact for a conspiracy against the revolution*!

That is what we have been saying from the very first day of the Kornilov revolt. Scores and hundreds of facts corroborate it. Exposures which no one has refuted leave no doubt about it.

In spite of this, the conspirators are in power, or in the purlieus of power. In spite of this, the farce continues—the farce of an inquiry, the farce of "revolution.". . .

A coalition with conspirators, a conspiratorial government—that, it appears, is what the defencist gentry have thrust upon the workers and soldiers!

Rabochy Put, No. 23,
September 29, 1917

Unsigned

A PAPER COALITION

Economic disruption is talked about. Economic disruption is written about. Economic disruption is used as a bogey, frequently with an allusion to the "anarchistic" sentiments of the workers. But nobody wants to admit openly that the disruption is frequently engineered and deliberately aggravated by the capitalists, who close down factories and doom the workers to unemployment. *Birzhovka* has some interesting information on this score.

"At the mills of the Russo-French Cotton Spinning Corporation in Pavlovsky Posad, Moscow Gubernia, a conflict arose over non-observance of the contract drawn up by a commission of the Orekhovo-Zuyevo district under the chairmanship of Minister Prokopovich. Some four thousand workers are employed at the mills. The workers' committee informed the Ministry of Labour that a grave situation had arisen owing to the refusal of the employers to submit to a decision of the arbitration court, and owing to their deliberate reduction of productivity of labour. Negotiations had been going on for four months, and now there was a danger of the mills being closed down. The management of the Russo-French mills, on its part, made representations to the French Embassy, affirming that the workers refused to obey a decision of the arbitration court and were threatening excesses and destruction of property. The French Embassy requested the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to assist in settling the dispute."

And what do we find? It appears that the "management of the mills" and the "French Embassy" have both libelled the workers in an effort to whitewash the lockout capitalists. Listen to this:

"The case was submitted to the Moscow Commissar of the Ministry of Labour, who, after investigating the conflict on the spot, informed the Minister of Labour that the *factory management had systematically evaded carrying out decisions of the arbitration court*. The report of the Ministry of Labour's Moscow Commissar has been transmitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs."

As we see, even a commissar of a counter-revolutionary Ministry had to admit that the workers were right.

Nor is that all. *Birzhovka* reports another and even more interesting case.

"The Ministry of Labour has been informed from Moscow that the management of the A. V. Smirnov factory had announced that the plant, which employs three thousand workers, would be closed down owing to lack of raw materials and fuel and the need for capital repairs. A commission, consisting of representatives of Moscow Fuel and the Moscow Factory Conference, together with the workers' committee of the factory, instituted an inquiry and found that the reasons given for closing down the factory were baseless, since there was sufficient raw material for operation and the repairs could be effected without suspending work. On the strength of this, *the workers arrested the factory owner. The Zemstvo Assembly has recommended the sequestration of the factory.* The Pokrovsky Executive Committee and the Provisional Government's uyezd commissar are assisting in the settlement of the conflict."

Such are the facts.

The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik compromisers cry from the housetops that a coalition with the "virile forces" of the country is essential, and they

definitely point to the Moscow industrialists. And they constantly stress that what they mean is not a verbal coalition in the Winter Palace, but a real coalition in the country. . . .

We ask:

Is any real coalition possible between factory owners who deliberately swell unemployment and workers who, with the benevolent assistance of Provisional Government commissars, arrest them for this?

Is there any limit to the stupidity of "revolutionary" windbags who never tire of singing the praises of coalition with lockout criminals?

Do not these ridiculous trumpeters of coalition realise that no coalition is possible now except on paper, a coalition concluded within the walls of the Winter Palace and doomed beforehand to failure?

Rabochy Put, No. 24,
September 30, 1917

Unsigned

COMMENTS

STARVATION IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

Everybody is now talking about the food crisis in the cities. The spectre of the "gaunt hand" of famine is stalking the towns. But nobody wants to admit that famine has now spread to the rural areas. Nobody wants to realise that it is starvation that is now the motivating cause of a good half of the "agrarian disorders" and "riots."

Here is a letter from a peasant on the subject of the agrarian "disorders":

> "I should like you to explain to us, 'the unenlightened folk, the peasants,' what is the reason for the riots? You think it is all the work of hooligans and vagabonds and drunken tramps, but you are a bit off the mark. It is not the work of vagabonds and tramps, but of people who are drunk from starvation. I, for instance, can tell you about the Murom Uyezd, the Arefino Volost. They want to starve us to death here. We get five pounds of flour a month per person. Just think what this means and try to understand our situation. How are we going to live? It is not so much people drunken with wine who are rioting here, but we ourselves, because we are 'hunger drunk'" (see *Birzhovka*).

The curs of the bourgeois *Dyen* and *Russkaya Volya* are constantly yelping that the countryside is rolling in wealth, that the muzhik is well off and so on. But the facts incontrovertibly show that the country-

side is suffering from starvation and exhaustion, from scurvy and other diseases due to starvation. And the conditions in the countryside grow more trying as time goes on, because, instead of food, the Kerensky-Konovalov government is planning to send new punitive expeditions into the countryside, and the approaching winter promises the muzhik new and still severer hardships.

The same peasant writes:

"The winter will soon be here, the rivers will freeze over, and there will be nothing left for us then but to starve to death. The railway station is a long way off. We shall go out and get food. Call us what you like, but starvation compels us to do this" (*Birzhovka*).

Such is the eloquent story of a peasant.

The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik compromisers trumpeted about the all-saving virtue of coalition and a coalition government. Now we have a "coalition" and a "coalition" government. But we ask:

Where is the all-saving virtue of this government?

What can it give the starving countryside except punitive expeditions?

Do Messieurs the compromisers not realise that the artless letter of this peasant pronounces sentence of death on the coalition they have concocted?

* * *

STARVATION IN THE FACTORIES

The sufferings of the factory areas are severer still. This is not the first time starvation has visited the industrial population, but never has it been so rampant.

Russia, which before the war exported 400-500 million poods of grain annually, now, in time of war, is unable to feed her own workers. Factories are coming to a standstill and the workers are fleeing from their jobs because the industrial areas are without bread, without food.

Here are some reports from various localities.

"A dispatch from Shuya states that wood sawing has stopped throughout the uyezd owing to lack of food. The Koryukovka sugar refinery may have to close down because there is no food for the workers. The sugar beet is beginning to rot. The 12,000 inhabitants of the Yartsevo spinning and weaving mills settlement, Smolensk Gubernia, are in a dreadful plight. Flour and cereal stocks are completely exhausted. The gubernia food committee is powerless. Not receiving food, the workers are getting restless. Disorders are inevitable. The factory stewards' council of the Kuvshinov paper mills, Tver Gubernia, wires: Workers on the verge of starvation; food denied everywhere; request immediate relief. The management of the Morokin factory, Vichuga, wires: Food situation menacing; workers starving and getting restless; urgent measures needed to ensure supplies. The factory committee of this company has sent the following telegram to the Ministry: Urgently implore supplies of flour for the workers, who are already starving."

Such are the facts.

The agricultural areas complain that they get extremely small supplies of manufactured goods from the factory areas. They therefore release grain for the factory areas in equally small quantities. But shortage of bread in the industrial areas is driving the workers from the factories and cutting down factory output, thus further reducing the quantity of goods sent to the countryside, and this, in its turn, leads to a further reduction of the amount of grain flowing to the

factories, worse starvation, and further desertions of workers from the factories.

We ask:

What is the way out of this vicious circle, of this iron vice which is gripping workers and peasants?

What has the so-called coalition government to offer besides the notorious "dictators" it is secretly sending to the starving industrial areas?

Do Messieurs the compromisers realise that the imperialist bourgeoisie, whom they are still supporting, have driven Russia into an impasse, from which there is no escape except by stopping the predatory war?

Rabochy Put, No. 26,
October 3, 1917

Unsigned

SELF-CHASTISEMENT

A little while ago a "most commonplace" incident occurred in Tashkent, "the like of which there are many" in Russia nowadays. The Tashkent workers and soldiers, swayed by the revolutionising logic of events, expressed their lack of confidence in the old Executive Committee of the Soviets, elected a new Revolutionary Committee, dismissed the Kornilov authorities and appointed others in their place, and took the power into their own hands. That was sufficient for the Perekhvat-Zalikhvats* of the Provisional Government to declare war on the "anarchist" Tashkent Soviet. True, the facts show that the majority of the Soviet are Socialist-Revolutionaries, not Anarchists. But that means nothing to the Provisional Government "pacifiers."

And the Socialist-Revolutionary Hamlets of *Delo Naroda*, who meekly follow at Kerensky's heel, proclaimed in their sagacity that the Tashkent Soviet was

* Perekhvat-Zalikhvatsky—a character in *History of a Town* by the Russian satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin.—*Tr.*

"counter-revolutionary," demanded the recall of the Socialist-Revolutionaries from the Soviet in Tashkent, and declared that "revolutionary order" must be established in Turkestan.

Even the decrepit Central Executive Committee considered it necessary to have a kick at the poor Tashkenters. . . .

Our Party alone vigorously and unreservedly supported the revolutionary Tashkent Soviet against the counter-revolutionary attacks of the government and its agents.

And what do we find?

Only a few weeks have elapsed since then, "passions have subsided," and a delegate who arrived yesterday from Tashkent tells us the true story of the Tashkent "incident"—and it turns out that the Tashkenters honestly performed their revolutionary duty, notwithstanding the counter-revolutionary exercises of the agents of the Provisional Government.

The Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has *unanimously* passed a resolution of confidence in the Tashkent comrades and, by the vote "of all its groups, the Soviet expresses its full readiness to support the just demands of the Tashkent revolutionary democracy." Moreover, explaining her vote, Shirokova declared on behalf of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party that it would vote for the Bolshevik resolution.

Well, then, what about the recall of the Socialist-Revolutionaries from the Tashkent Soviet? What has become of the "counter-revolutionary character" of that Soviet and its "unseemly conduct"?

All this is now forgotten. . . .

Very good, we welcome the Socialist-Revolutionaries' "change of heart." Better late than never.

But do the *Delo Naroda* leaders realise that they mercilessly chastised themselves a fortnight ago when they pusillanimously turned their backs on the Tashkent Soviet?

Rabochy Put, No. 27,
October 4, 1917

Unsigned

THE PLOT AGAINST THE REVOLUTION

Burtsev said recently in *Obshcheye Delo* that "there was no Kornilov *conspiracy*," that there was "only a *compact*" between Kornilov and the Kerensky government to wipe out the Bolsheviks and the Soviets with a view to establishing a military dictatorship. In confirmation of this, Burtsev publishes in *Obshcheye Delo*, No. 6, an "explanatory memorandum" of Kornilov's, consisting of a number of documents which give the history of the conspiracy. The immediate object of Burtsev's move is to create a favourable atmosphere for Kornilov and to enable him to escape trial.

We are far from inclined to consider Kornilov's materials exhaustive. Apart from the fact that Kornilov is trying to shield himself from the charge of treason, he omits to mention, for example, certain persons and organisations implicated in the conspiracy, in the first place, representatives of certain Embassies at General Headquarters who, on the evidence of witnesses, played a by no means secondary role. It should also be noted that Kornilov's "explanatory memorandum" was police-edited by Burtsev, who deleted several, and probably very important, passages from it. Nevertheless, the "memorandum" is of great value as documentary

evidence, and until it is countered by testimony of equal weight, it is as documentary evidence that we shall treat it.

We therefore consider it necessary to discuss this document with our readers.

Who Were They?

Who were Kornilov's advisers and inspirers? To whom did he confide his conspiratorial designs in the first place?

"I wanted," says Kornilov, "to invite M. Rodzyanko, Prince G. Lvov and P. Milyukov to participate in the discussion of the state of the country and the measures needed to save it and the army from complete collapse, and requests were wired to them to be at General Headquarters not later than August 29."

Those were the principal advisers, on the admission of Kornilov himself.

Nor is that all. Besides advisers and inspirers, Kornilov had major collaborators, in whom he placed his hopes, on whom he relied, and with whom he intended to carry out his plot.

Listen to this:

"A project for the constitution of a 'Council of National Defence' was drawn up, to consist of the Supreme Commander as Chairman and Kerensky as Vice Chairman, Savinkov, General Alexeyev, Admiral Kolchak and Filonenko. This Council of Defence *was to exercise a collective dictatorship*, since it was recognised that a one-man dictatorship would be undesirable. Other Ministers suggested were Messrs. Takhtamyshev, Tretyakov, Pokrovsky, Ignatyev, Aladin, Plekhanov, Lvov and Zavoiko."

This was the sinister band of right honourable conspirators who inspired Kornilov and were inspired by him, who secretly confabulated with him behind the backs of the people and applauded him at the Moscow Conference. *Milyukov*, head of the Party of Popular Freedom; *Rodzyanko*, head of the Council of Public Men; *Tretyakov*, head of the industrialists; *Kerensky*, head of the Socialist-Revolutionary defencists; *Plekhanov*, teacher of the Menshevik defencists; *Aladin*, agent of an unknown firm in London—these were the hope and trust of the Kornilovites, the heart and nerves of the counter-revolution.

Let us hope that history will not forget them and that their contemporaries will give them their deserts.

Their Aims

Their aims were "clear and simple": to "improve the fighting efficiency of the army" and "create a healthy rear" for the purpose of "saving Russia."

As a means of improving the fighting efficiency of the army, "I pointed," says Kornilov,

> "to the necessity of immediately restoring the death penalty in the theatre of military operations."

As a means of creating a healthy rear, "I pointed," Kornilov continues,

> "to the necessity of extending the death penalty and the revolutionary military courts to the interior military areas, on the assumption that no measures for restoring the fighting efficiency

of the army would have the desired effect so long as the army received as replenishments from the rear bands of dissolute, untrained and propagandised soldiers."

But that was not all. In Kornilov's opinion, "in order to achieve the objects of the war" . . . it was necessary to have three armies: "the one in the trenches, and a labour army and a railway army in the rear." In other words, it was "necessary" to extend military "discipline," with all its implications, to the munitions factories and the railways; that is, it was "necessary" to militarise them.

And so, the death penalty at the front, the death penalty in the rear, militarisation of the factories and railways, conversion of the country into a "military" camp, and, as the coping stone, a military dictatorship presided over by Kornilov—such, it transpires, were the aims of this gang of conspirators.

These aims were expounded in a special "report" which had acquired notoriety even before the Moscow Conference. They are to be found in Kornilov's telegrams and "memorandum" under the designation of "Kornilov's demands."

Were these "demands" known to the Kerensky government?

They undoubtedly were.

Was the Kerensky government in agreement with Kornilov?

It evidently was.

"After signing the general report on measures for restoring the morale of the army and the rear, which had already been signed by Messrs. Savinkov and Filonenko," Kornilov says, "I submitted it to a private conference of the Provisional Government composed of Messrs. Kerensky, Nekrasov and Tereshchenko.

After the report was examined, I was informed that the government agreed with all the measures proposed, but that their implementation was a question of the tempo of government measures."

Savinkov said the same thing when he told Kornilov on August 24: "The Provisional Government will comply with your demands within the next few days."

Were Kornilov's aims known to the Party of Popular Freedom?

They undoubtedly were.

Did it agree with Kornilov?

It evidently did, for *Rech*, central organ of the Party of Popular Freedom, publicly stated that it "fully shared General Kornilov's ideals."

Our Party was right when it asserted that the Party of Popular Freedom is a party of bourgeois dictatorship.

Our party was right when it asserted that the Kerensky government is a screen for this dictatorship.

Now that the Kornilovites have recovered from the first blow the plotters in power have again begun to talk about "improving the fighting efficiency of the army" and "creating a healthy rear."

The workers and soldiers must remember that "improving the fighting efficiency of the army" and "creating a healthy rear" mean the death penalty in the rear and at the front.

Their Method

Their method was as "clear and simple" as their aims. It was to wipe out Bolshevism, disperse the Soviets, make Petrograd a special military governorship and disarm Kronstadt. In short, to smash the

revolution. It was for this that the Third Cavalry Corps was needed. It was for this that the Savage Division was needed.

Here is what Savinkov said to Kornilov after discussing with him the boundaries of the Petrograd military governorship:

"Thus, Lavr Georgievich, the Provisional Government will comply with your demands within the next few days, but the government is afraid that serious complications may arise in Petrograd. You know, of course, that serious action by the Bolsheviks is expected in Petrograd approximately on August 28 or 29. The publication of your demands, carried out through the Provisional Government, will, of course, serve as a spur to the Bolsheviks' action. Although we have sufficient troops at our disposal, we cannot rely upon them fully; the more so as we do not yet know what attitude the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies will adopt towards the new law. It, too, may be opposed to the government, and if so, we shall be unable to rely on our troops. I therefore request you to give orders to have the Third Cavalry Corps brought to Petrograd by the end of August and placed at the disposal of the Provisional Government. If, besides the Bolsheviks, the members of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies should also take action, we shall have to operate against them too."

And Savinkov added that the operations must be most resolute and ruthless. To this General Kornilov replied that he "cannot conceive of any other operations; if the Bolsheviks and the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies take action they will be suppressed with the utmost energy."

For the direct execution of these measures Kornilov assigned General Krymov, commander of the Third Cavalry Corps and the native division, "two missions":

"1) In the event of receiving from me (Kornilov), or directly on the spot, news that a Bolshevik action had begun, he was to move the corps immediately to Petrograd, occupy the city, disarm the units of the Petrograd garrison which joined the Bolshevik movement, disarm the population of Petrograd and disperse the Soviets;

"2) On the execution of this mission General Krymov was to send a brigade reinforced with artillery to Oranienbaum, which on its arrival was to call upon the Kronstadt garrison to dismantle the fortress and to cross to the mainland.

"The Prime Minister's consent to the dismantling of the Krondstadt fortress and the evacuation of the garrison was received on August 8, and a report to this effect, with the minute of the Prime Minister, was sent by Naval Headquarters to the Supreme Commander's Chief of Staff with a letter from Admiral Maximov."

Such was the method adopted by this sinister band of plotters against the revolution and its conquests.

The Kerensky government not only knew of this diabolical plan, but itself took part in elaborating it, and, together with Kornilov, was preparing to carry it out.

Savinkov, who at that time was still Deputy Minister of War, openly admits this to have been the case, and his statement, known to everyone, has not yet been refuted by anyone.

Here it is:

"I consider it my duty, for the sake of historical accuracy, to declare that on the instructions of the Prime Minister, I requested you (Kornilov) to send the Cavalry Corps to ensure the establishment of martial law in Petrograd and the suppression of any attempt at revolt against the Provisional Government, no matter from what quarter it might proceed. . . ."

Clear, one would think.

Did the Cadet Party know about Kornilov's plan? It undoubtedly did.

For on the eve of the Kornilov revolt, *Rech*, the party's central organ, assiduously circulated provocative rumours of a "Bolshevik uprising," *thus paving the way* for Kornilov's invasion of Petrograd and Kronstadt.

And, as is evident from Kornilov's "memorandum," *a representative* of the Cadet Party, Mr. Maklakov, "personally" took part in all the talks between Savinkov and Kornilov on the plans for the invasion of Petrograd. As far as we know, Maklakov did not then occupy any official post under or in the Provisional Government. In what other capacity, then, could he have taken part in these talks, if not as a representative of his party?

Such are the facts.

Our Party was right when it asserted that the Kerensky government is a government of bourgeois counter-revolution, that it relies upon the Kornilovites and is distinguished from the latter only by a certain "irresolution."

Our Party was right when it asserted that the ideological and political threads of the counter-revolution converge in the Central Committee of the Cadet Party.

If the counter-revolutionary plan of the Petrograd and Mogilev plotters failed, it was not the fault of Kerensky and Kornilov, or of Maklakov and Savinkov, but of the very Soviets which they were preparing to "disperse," but which they were not strong enough to withstand.

Now that the Kornilovites have recovered and wormed their way into power with the aid of the compromisers, the question of fighting the Soviets

is again being raised. The workers and soldiers must remember that if they do not support the struggle of the Soviets against the Kornilovite government, they run the risk of falling under the iron heel of a military dictatorship.

A Dictatorship of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie

What is this "collective dictatorship" which the plotters against the revolution—Kornilov and Milyukov, Aladin and Filonenko, Kerensky and Prince Lvov, Rodzyanko and Savinkov—conspired to establish? In what political form did they intend to clothe it?

What political institutions did they consider necessary for the establishment and smooth working of this "collective dictatorship"?

Let the documents speak for themselves.

"General Kornilov asked Filonenko whether he did not think that the only way out of the grave situation was the proclamation of a military dictatorship.

"Filonenko replied that considering the question practically, in the light of the existing situation, the only person he could conceive in the capacity of dictator was General Kornilov. But against a one-man dictatorship Filonenko advanced the following objection. General Kornilov lacked sufficient knowledge of the political situation, and therefore under his dictatorship there would arise what is usually called a camarilla. The democratic and republican elements would be bound to oppose this, and hence would oppose a one-man dictatorship.

"*General Kornilov*: What then is to be done, seeing that the government is taking no measures?

"*Filonenko*: A way out might be the formation of a Directory. A small War Cabinet consisting of men of exceptionally strong

will should be formed within the government. This cabinet, which might be called the 'Council of National Defence' or some other name—the name makes no difference—must include, as an indispensable condition, Kerensky, General Kornilov and Savinkov. The cardinal object of this small cabinet should be the defence of the country. In such form, the Directory project ought to be acceptable to the government.

"*Kornilov*: You are right. What is needed is a Directory, and as soon as possible. . ." (*Novoye Vremya*).

Further:

"A project for the constitution of a 'Council of National Defence' was drawn up, to consist of the Supreme Commander as Chairman and A. F. Kerensky as Vice Chairman, Mr. Savinkov, General Alexeyev, Admiral Kolchak and Mr. Filonenko.

"This Council of Defence was to exercise a collective dictatorship, since it was recognised that a one-man dictatorship would be undesirable" (*Obshcheye Delo*).

Thus, a *Directory* was the political form the Kornilov-Kerensky "collective dictatorship" was to have been clothed in.

It should now be clear to everyone that in creating a Directory after the failure of the Kornilov "revolt," Kerensky was establishing *this same Kornilov dictatorship* by other means.

It should now be clear to everyone that when, at its celebrated night session, the decrepit Central Executive Committee declared in favour of Kerensky's Directory, it voted for General Kornilov's counter-revolutionary plan.

It should now be clear to everyone that when they were foaming at the mouth in advocacy of Kerensky's Directory, the wiseacres of *Delo Naroda* were, without

realising it themselves, betraying the revolution, to the glee of the overt and covert Kornilovites.

Our Party was right when it asserted that the Directory was a masked form of counter-revolutionary dictatorship.

But a Directory alone "will not carry you far." The virtuosos of counter-revolution could not but realise that it was impossible to "rule" a country which had tasted the fruits of democracy merely with the aid of a Directory, without some sort of "democratic" cloak. A "collective dictatorship" in the form of a Directory—yes! But why a naked one? Would it not be better to cloak it with something in the nature of a "Pre-parliament"? Let there be a "democratic Pre-parliament" and let it talk, so long as the machinery of state is in the hands of the Directory! We know that it was Mr. Zavoiko, Kornilov's attorney, Mr. Aladin, agent of an unknown firm in London, and Kornilov "himself," Milyukov's friend, who were the first to suggest the idea of a "Pre-parliament" as a prop and screen for the Directory, which was to be "responsible" (no joke!) to this "Pre-parliament."

Let the document speak for itself.

"When insisting on the creation of a Directory, General Kornilov and his circle did not conceive it as not being responsible to the country.

"M. M. Filonenko was one of the firmest supporters of Aladin's proposal for a representative body to which the government would be unconditionally responsible pending the convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

"This representative body, as Aladin conceived it, was to consist of the Fourth State Duma (except for the Right wing and all the inactive members), the Left elements of the first three

Dumas, a delegation from the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies (without limitation of representation of the parties) and ten to twenty of the most prominent revolutionary leaders, such as Breshko-Breshkovskaya, Kropotkin, Figner, etc., who were to be co-opted to the representative body by the body itself. Thus the idea of a 'Pre-parliament' was first conceived by A. F. Aladin" (*Novoye Vremya*).

And so, the "representative body" that was to serve as a "democratic" prop for the Kornilov-Kerensky "collective dictatorship" was to be a "*Pre-parliament.*"

A "Pre-parliament" as the body to which the government was to be "responsible" "*pending the convocation*" of a Constituent Assembly; a "Pre-parliament" that was *to be a substitute* for the Constituent Assembly until the latter was convened; a "Pre-parliament" that was *to be a substitute* for the Constituent Assembly if the convocation of the latter were postponed; a "Pre-parliament" that was to *provide* the "legal *grounds*" (rejoice, o ye lawyers!) for *postponing* the convocation of the Constituent Assembly; a "Pre-parliament" as *a means of torpedoing* the Constituent Assembly—that was the sum and substance of the counter-revolutionary "democracy" of the plotters against the revolution.

It should now be clear to everyone that in "sanctioning" the Kornilov "Pre-parliament" which is to meet in two days' time, Kerensky is merely carrying out by other means *the counter-revolutionary plan* of the plotters against the revolution.

It should now be clear to everyone that in organising the "Pre-parliament" and in committing a number of forgeries for the purpose, the Avksentyevs and Dans worked for the overt and covert Kornilovites and against the revolution and its conquests.

It should now be clear to everyone that when they call for a Constituent Assembly and at the same time support the Kornilov "Pre-parliament," the wiseacres of *Delo Naroda* are working to torpedo the Constituent Assembly.

Kornilov's pupils—that is all they have proved capable of being, those "responsible" chatterboxes at the "Democratic Conference," the Tseretelis and Chernovs, the Avksentyevs and Dans.

* * *

First Conclusion

It is evident from the documents examined that the "Kornilov affair" was not a "revolt" against the Provisional Government, and not simply the "adventure" of an ambitious general, but a regular conspiracy against the revolution, an organised and thoroughly planned conspiracy.

Its organisers and instigators were the counter-revolutionary elements among the generals, representatives of the Cadet Party, representatives of the "public men" of Moscow, the more "initiated" members of the Provisional Government, and—last but not least!—certain representatives of certain embassies (about them the Kornilov "memorandum" says nothing).

In a word, all those who "jubilantly" hailed Kornilov at the Moscow Conference as the "recognised leader of Russia."

The "Kornilov conspiracy" was a conspiracy of the imperialist bourgeoisie against the revolutionary classes of Russia, against the proletariat and the peasantry.

The aim of the conspiracy was to crush the revolution and establish a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

There were divergencies among the plotters, but they were of a minor, quantitative order. They concerned the "tempo of government measures": Kerensky wanted to act cautiously and circumspectly, Kornilov wanted to "crash through." But they were in agreement on the main thing: the establishment of a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the form of the "collective dictatorship" of a *Directory*, cloaked by a "democratic" *Pre-parliament* as a bait for simpletons.

What is the distinguishing feature of a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

First of all, such a dictatorship means the rule of a bellicose and exploiting minority over the majority, the working people, who long for peace. Read Kornilov's "memorandum," glance through the "negotiations" with the members of the government, and you will find references there to measures for suppressing the revolution, to means of strengthening the bourgeois system and of prolonging the imperialist war, but you will not find a single word about the peasants, who are demanding land, about the workers, who are demanding bread, about the majority of the citizens, who are longing for peace. More, the whole "memorandum" is based on the assumption that the masses must be held in an iron vice, while the reins of government must be in the hands of a small group of dictators.

Secondly, a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie is a clandestine, secret, disguised dictatorship designed to deceive the masses. Read the "memoran-

dum," and you will realise how zealously the conspirators endeavoured to conceal their sinister plans and underhand machinations not only from the masses, but even from their official colleagues and party "friends." It was in order to hoodwink the masses that the plan for a "democratic" Pre-parliament was concocted; for what democracy can there be with the death penalty in operation in the rear and at the front? It was in order to hoodwink the masses that the "Russian Republic" was preserved; for what republic can there be when a little group of five dictators are the omnipotent power?

Lastly, a dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie is a dictatorship based on coercion of the masses. Such a dictatorship can have no "reliable" support other than systematic coercion of the masses. The death penalty in the rear and at the front, militarisation of the factories and railways, firing squads—these are the weapons that form the arsenal of such a dictatorship. "Democratic" deception reinforced by coercion; coercion concealed by "democratic" deception—such is the alpha and omega of the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

It was precisely such a dictatorship that the conspirators wanted to establish in Russia.

* * *

Second Conclusion

We are by no means inclined to seek the reasons for the conspiracy in the evil intent of individual heroes. Equally little are we inclined to attribute the conspiracy to a lust for power on the part of its initiators.

The reasons for the counter-revolutionary conspiracy lie deeper. They must be sought for in the conditions of the imperialist war. They must be sought for in the requirements of this war. It is in the policy of launching an offensive at the front espoused by the Provisional Government in June that we must seek the soil from which the counter-revolutionary conspiracy sprang. Everywhere, in all belligerent countries, a policy of offensive in the atmosphere of imperialist war has given rise to the necessity of abolishing liberties, introducing martial law, establishing "iron discipline"; for when maximum liberty prevails it is impossible with impunity to drive the masses to the shambles engineered by the vampires that prey on the world. Russia could not be an exception in this respect.

In June, under the pressure of the imperialist cliques, home and Allied, an offensive at the front was proclaimed. The soldiers refused to go into action without protest. Regiments were disbanded, but this measure proved ineffective. The army was thereupon declared to be "unfit to fight." For the sake of "improving the fighting efficiency" of the army, Kornilov (and not only Kornilov!) demanded the introduction of the death penalty at the front, and as a preliminary measure prohibited soldiers' meetings and assemblies. The soldiers and workers in the rear protested against this, and thereby intensified the indignation of the soldiers at the front. In retaliation, the generals at the front, supported by the bourgeoisie, demanded the extension of the death penalty to the rear and the militarisation of the factories and railways. The plan for a dictatorship and the conspiracy were merely a logical development of these

measures. Such is the brief history of the "restoration of iron discipline" and the development of the counter-revolution so picturesquely described in Kornilov's "memorandum." The counter-revolution came from the front, having arisen out of the requirements of an offensive in the conditions of imperialist war. The aim of the conspiracy was to organise and legalise the already existing counter-revolution and to extend it to the whole of Russia.

The June the Third die-hards of the tsarist Duma knew what they were up to when already in the beginning of June they demanded an "immediate" offensive in close co-ordination with the Allies. These old hands at counter-revolution knew that a policy of offensive must inevitably lead to counter-revolution.

Our Party was right when in its declaration at the Congress of Soviets it warned that an offensive at the front would be a mortal threat to the revolution.

In rejecting our Party's declaration the defencist leaders once again proved their political immaturity and ideological dependence on the imperialist bourgeoisie.

What follows from this?

There can be only one conclusion. The conspiracy was a continuation of the counter-revolution which arose out of the requirements of the imperialist war and the policy of offensive. So long as this war and this policy continue there will always be the danger of counter-revolutionary plots. In order to safeguard the revolution from this danger, the imperialist war must be stopped, the possibility of a policy of offensive must be eliminated, and a democratic peace must be won.

* * *

Third Conclusion

Kornilov and his "accomplices" have been arrested. The investigating committee set up by the government is working at "top speed." The Provisional Government is posing as the supreme judge. Kornilov and his "accomplices" have been assigned the role of "rebels," and the *Rech* and *Novoye Vremya* gentry the role of Kornilov's defence counsel. "It will be an interesting trial," say the news-fans. "The trial will result in many important revelations," remarks *Delo Naroda* with an air of profundity.

Revolt against whom? Against the revolution, of course! But where is the revolution? In the Provisional Government, of course; for the revolt was raised against the Provisional Government. And of whom does this revolution consist? Of the "everlasting" Kerensky, representatives of the Cadet Party, representatives of the "public men" of Moscow, and a certain Sir——, who is behind these gentlemen. First voice: "But Kornilov has been left out!" Second voice: "Kornilov doesn't come into it. He's been ordered into the dock.". . .

But let us drop the curtain. Kornilov did indeed hatch a conspiracy against the revolution. But he was not alone. He had instigators—Milyukov and Rodzyanko, Lvov and Maklakov, Filonenko and Nabokov. He had collaborators—Kerensky and Savinkov, Alexeyev and Kaledin. Does it not sound like a fairy tale that these gentlemen and their ilk are now serenely going about at large, and not only going about at large, but "ruling" the country, and under a constitution

framed by Kornilov "himself"? And, lastly, Kornilov had the support of the Russian and the British and French imperialist bourgeoisie, in whose interests all these Kornilovite collaborators are now "ruling" the country. Is it not clear that to try Kornilov alone is a wretched and ridiculous farce? On the other hand, how can the imperialist bourgeoisie, the principal culprit in the plot against the revolution, be brought to trial? There's a problem for the sapient craftsmen in the Ministry of Justice!

Obviously, the point is not the farcical trial. The point is that, after the Kornilov revolt, after the sensational arrests and the "strict" inquiry, it "turns out" that the power is again wholly and solely in the hands of the Kornilovites. That which Kornilov tried to achieve by force of arms is now being gradually but persistently achieved by the Kornilovites in power, although by other means. Even Kornilov's "Pre-parliament" has been brought into being.

The point is that, after the successful "liquidation" of the plot against the revolution, it "turns out" that we are again in the power of the plotters' general staff, of this same Kerensky and this same Tereshchenko, of these same representatives of the Cadet Party and the "public men," of these same Sirs and Sir-like generals. Only Kornilov is missing. But, then, is Sir M. V. Alexeyev, who has his finger in every important government affair, and who, it transpires, is about to represent Russia—or is it England?—at the Entente conference, any worse than Kornilov?

The point is that this "government" of conspirators cannot be tolerated any longer.

The point is that this "government" of conspirators cannot be trusted without the risk of exposing the revolution to the mortal danger of fresh conspiracies.

Yes, the plotters against the revolution must be brought to trial. But it must not be a travesty, nor a mock trial, it must be a genuine trial, before a people's court. And the object of the trial must be to take the power out of the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie, in whose interest the present "government" of conspirators is operating. The object of the trial must be thoroughly to purge the administration of Kornilovite elements, from top to bottom.

We have said that unless the imperialist war is stopped and a democratic peace achieved it will be impossible to safeguard the revolution from counter-revolutionary conspiracies. But so long as the present "government" is in power it is useless to dream of a democratic peace. In order to achieve such a peace this government must be "removed" and another one "installed."

This requires transferring the power to the new, the revolutionary classes, the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry. It requires concentrating the power in the revolutionary mass organisations, the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

It was these classes and organisations, and they alone, that saved the revolution from the Kornilov conspiracy. And it is they that will ensure its victory.

It is in this that the trial of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its agents, the conspirators, will consist.

* *
*

Two Questions

First question. A few weeks ago, when the scandalous revelations about the government's (not Kornilov's, but the government's!) plot against the revolution first began to appear in the papers, the Bolshevik group submitted a question in the Central Executive Committee addressed to Avksentyev and Skobelev, who were members of the Provisional Government at the time of the "Kornilov epic." It concerned the evidence which Avksentyev and Skobelev, as a matter of honour and of duty to the democracy, should have given on the revelations accusing the Provisional Government. Our group's question was seconded by the Bureau of the Central Executive Committee that very same day, and thus became the question of "the whole revolutionary democracy." Since then a month has passed, revelation follows revelation, each more scandalous than the other, but Avksentyev and Skobelev continue to remain tongue-tied and say nothing, as though the matter did not concern them. Do not our readers think that it is time these "responsible" citizens heeded the elementary rules of decency and replied at last to a question addressed to them by "the whole revolutionary democracy?"

Second question. At the very height of the new revelations about the Kerensky government, *Delo Naroda* urged its readers to "be patient" with this government and "wait" until the Constituent Assembly was convened. Of course, it is amusing to hear appeals to "be patient" coming from people who with their own hands created this government for the purpose of "saving the country." Is this why they created this government—only to grit

their teeth and "be patient" with it for a "short while"?... But what does "being patient" with the Kerensky government mean? It means making plotters against the revolution the arbiters of the destiny of a nation of many millions. It means making agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie the arbiters of war and peace. It means making tireless counter-revolutionaries the arbiters of the Constituent Assembly. What name should we give to a "socialist" party which links its political destiny with that of a "government" of plotters against the revolution? It is said that the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party are "naive." It is said that *Delo Naroda* is "short-sighted." There is no doubt that the "responsible" leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionaries do not lack these "virtues." But . . . do not our readers think that naïveté in politics is a crime bordering on treason?

Rabochy Put, Nos. 27, 28 and 30,
October 4, 5 and 7, 1917

Signed: *K. Stalin*

WHO IS TORPEDOING THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY?

While the compromising windbags pour out speeches about the Pre-parliament, and their fellow travellers are fighting the Bolsheviks and accusing them of torpedoing the Constituent Assembly, the old hands at counter-revolution are already making a preliminary trial of strength with a view to really torpedoing the Constituent Assembly.

Only a week ago the leaders of the "Don Cossacks" proposed that the elections to the Constituent Assembly be postponed on the grounds that "the population is unprepared."

Two days later *Dyen*, a close collaborator of the Cadet *Rech*, blurted out that "the wave of agrarian disorders . . . might cause the postponement of the Constituent Assembly elections."

And yesterday the news was wired that the "public men" in Moscow, the same gentry who now direct the Provisional Government, also "consider it impossible" to hold elections to the Constituent Assembly:

"State Duma member N. N. Lvov stated that it would be impossible, for technical and political reasons, to hold elections just now owing to the state of anarchy in the country. And

Kuzmin-Karavayev added that the government was not ready for the Constituent Assembly, no bills having yet been drafted."

Evidently the bourgeoisie intend to frustrate the elections to the Constituent Assembly.

Evidently, now that the bourgeoisie has entrenched itself in the Provisional Government and has created for itself a "democratic" camouflage in the shape of the counter-revolutionary Pre-parliament, it considers itself strong enough to "postpone" once again the convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

What have Messieurs the compromisers of *Izvestia* and *Delo Naroda* to oppose to this danger?

What have they to oppose to the Provisional Government if it, "heeding the voice of the country" and following in the footsteps of the "public men," postpones the Constituent Assembly elections?

The notorious Pre-parliament perhaps? But, created in accordance with Kornilov's plan and intended for the purpose of concealing the ulcers of the Kerensky government, the Pre-parliament was called into being precisely with the object of serving as a substitute for the Constituent Assembly, should its convocation be postponed. Of what value, then, can this Kornilov abortion be in the fight for a Constituent Assembly?

The decrepit Central Executive Committee, perhaps? But what authority can this institution have, when it is divorced from the masses and lashes out at the railwaymen one day and at the Soviets another?

The "great Russian revolution," perhaps, about which *Delo Naroda* cants so revoltingly? But the wiseacres of *Delo Naroda* themselves say that revolution is incompatible with a Constituent Assembly ("either revolu-

tion or a Constituent Assembly"!). What force can empty talk about the "might of the revolution" have in the fight for a Constituent Assembly?

Where is the force capable of opposing the counter-revolutionary efforts of the bourgeoisie?

That force is the growing Russian revolution. The compromisers have no faith in it. But that does not prevent it from growing, from spreading to the rural districts and sweeping away the basis of landlord rule.

By fighting the Congress of Soviets[85] and strengthening the Kornilov Pre-parliament, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are helping the bourgeoisie to torpedo the Constituent Assembly. But let them know that if they continue in this course they will have to deal with the growing revolution.

Rabochy Put, No. 28,
October 5, 1917

Editorial

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION IS MOBILISING—PREPARE TO RESIST!

The revolution lives. Having thwarted the Kornilov "revolt" and stirred up the front, having swept the towns and awakened the industrial districts, it is now spreading to the countryside and sweeping away the hated pillars of landlord rule.

The last prop of compromise is falling. The fight against the Kornilov revolt dispelled the compromise illusions of the workers and soldiers and rallied them around our Party. The fight against the landlords will dispel the compromise illusions of the peasants and muster them around the workers and soldiers.

In a fight against the defencists, and in spite of them, a revolutionary front of workers, soldiers and peasants is being built. In a fight against the compromisers, and in spite of them, this front is growing and becoming stronger.

The revolution is mobilising its forces and expelling the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary compromisers from its midst.

At the same time the counter-revolution is also mobilising its forces.

The Cadet Party, that hotbed of counter-revolution, is the first to start the fight by agitating on behalf

of Kornilov. Having taken over the power and unchained Suvorin's yelping curs, having cloaked itself in the mantle of the Socialist-Revolutionary-Menshevik-Kornilov Pre-parliament and assured itself the support of the counter-revolutionary generals, the Cadet Party is plotting another Kornilov revolt and threatening to crush the revolution.

The Moscow "Union of Public Men," that union of lockout-men and of the "gaunt hand of famine," which helped Kornilov to strangle the soldiers and workers and to disperse the Soviets in the rear and the Committees at the front, is convening three days from now a "*second Moscow Conference,*" to which it is urgently inviting representatives of the "Union of Cossack Troops."

At the front, particularly in the South and the West, a secret league of Kornilovite generals is feverishly organising a new attack upon the revolution, and is mustering all the forces suitable for this foul "work." . . .

And the Kerensky government, the government which in conjunction with Kornilov hatched the plot against the revolution, is preparing to flee to Moscow in order, after surrendering Petrograd to the Germans, to hatch another and more formidable plot against the revolution in conjunction with the Ryabushinskys and Buryshkins, the Kaledins and Alexeyevs.

There is no possible room for doubt. In opposition to the front of revolution, a front of counter-revolution, a front of the capitalists and landlords, of the Kerensky government and the Pre-parliament is forming and gaining strength. The counter-revolutionaries are plotting another Kornilov revolt.

The first Kornilov conspiracy was thwarted; but the counter-revolution was not crushed. It merely retreated, hid behind the back of the Kerensky government and entrenched itself in new positions.

The second Kornilov conspiracy, now being hatched, must be utterly crushed in order to safeguard the revolution for good.

The first counter-revolutionary offensive was thwarted by the workers and soldiers, by the Soviets in the rear and the Committees at the front.

The Soviets and Committees must take every measure to ensure that the second counter-revolutionary offensive is swept away by the full might of the great revolution.

Let the workers and soldiers know, let the peasants and sailors know that the fight is for *peace* and *bread*, for *land* and *liberty*, against the capitalists and landlords, against the profiteers and marauders, against the traitors and treasonmongers, against all who do not want to put an end once and for all to the Kornilovites who are now organising.

The Kornilovites are mobilising. Prepare to resist!

Rabochy Put, No. 32,
October 10, 1917

Editorial

WHO NEEDS THE PRE-PARLIAMENT?

When, several months ago, Kornilov planned the dispersal of the Soviets and the establishment of a military dictatorship, he decided at the same time to convene a "democratic" Pre-parliament.

What for?

In order to substitute the Pre-parliament for the Soviets, to use it to mask the counter-revolutionary nature of Kornilovism and to deceive the people as to the real aims of the Kornilov "reforms."

After the "liquidation" of the Kornilov revolt, Kerensky and the Cadets, Chernov and the Moscow industrialists organised a "new" coalition dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and decided at the same time to convene the Kornilov Pre-parliament.

What for?

Was it for the purpose of fighting the Soviets? Was it for the purpose of masking Kerenskyism, which differs very little from Kornilovism? Avksentyev assures us that the Pre-parliament was convened for the "salvation of the fatherland." Chernov "develops" Avksentyev's idea and assures us that the aim of the Pre-parliament is the "salvation of the country and the republic." But Kornilov also thought of "saving the country and the republic"

when he decided to establish a military dictatorship and mask it with a Pre-parliament. In what way does the Avksentyev-Chernov "salvation" differ from Kornilov's?

Well then, for what purpose has the present Kornilov abortion, the so-called Pre-parliament, been called into being?

Let us listen to what Mr. Adzhemov, one of the original architects of the Pre-parliament, a member of the Central Committee of the Cadet Party, former member of the Provisional Committee of the State Duma, and now a member of the Pre-parliament, has to say. Let us listen to him, because he is more candid than others:

"It should be the primary task of the Pre-parliament to lay a foundation for the government, to invest it with power, which, of course, it does not now possess."

But for what purpose does the government need this "power"? Against whom is it to be directed?

Listen further:

"The cardinal question is, will the Pre-parliament pass the rehearsal, will it be able to administer the necessary rebuff to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies? It is beyond doubt that the Soviet and the Pre-parliament are adversaries, just as two months from now the Constituent Assembly and these organisations will be adversaries. If the Pre-parliament stands the test, the work may go with a swing" (see Sunday's *Dyen*).

Well, that puts it clearly! That's frank and, if you like, honest.

The Pre-parliament will give the government "power" in order to "administer a rebuff to the Soviets," because the Pre-parliament, and it alone, can be "counterposed" to the Soviets.

Now we know that the Pre-parliament has been called into being not for the "salvation of the country," but to fight the Soviets. Now we know that the renegades from the ranks of democracy, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, have ensconced themselves in the Pre-parliament not in order to "save the revolution" but to help the bourgeoisie fight the Soviets. It is not for nothing they are desperately opposing a Congress of Soviets.

"If the Pre-parliament stands the test, the work may go with a swing," Mr. Adzhemov hopes.

The workers and soldiers will do everything in their power to see that the Kornilov abortion *does not* "stand the test," and that its foul "work" *does not* "go with a swing."

Rabochy Put, No. 32,
October 10, 1917

Unsigned

SOVIET POWER

In the first days of the revolution the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" was a novelty. "Soviet power" was set up in opposition to the power of the Provisional Government for the first time in April. The majority in the capital were still in favour of a Provisional Government without Milyukov and Guchkov. In June, this slogan secured the demonstrative recognition of the overwhelming majority of the workers and soldiers. The Provisional Government was already isolated in the capital. In July, the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" was the issue in a struggle which flared up between the revolutionary majority in the capital and the Lvov-Kerensky government. The compromising Central Executive Committee, relying on the backwardness of the provinces, went over to the side of the government. The struggle ended in favour of the government. The adherents of Soviet power were outlawed. There set in a dead season of "socialist" repressions and "republican" jailings, of Bonapartist intrigues and military plots, of firing squads at the front and "conferences" in the rear. This went on until the latter part of August. Towards the end of August the picture radically changed. The Kornilov revolt called forth the exertion of all the energies of the revolution.

The Soviets in the rear and the Committees at the front, which were almost defunct in July and August, "suddenly" revived and took over power in Siberia and the Caucasus, in Finland and the Urals, in Odessa and Kharkov. Had this not been so, had power not been taken, the revolution would have been crushed. Thus, "Soviet power," proclaimed in April by a "small group" of Bolsheviks in Petrograd, at the end of August obtained the almost universal recognition of the revolutionary classes of Russia.

It is now clear to all that "Soviet power" is not only a popular slogan, but the only sure weapon in the struggle for the victory of the revolution, the only way out from the present situation.

The time has at last come to put the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" into practice.

But what is "Soviet power," and how does it differ from every other power?

It is said that transferring power to the Soviets means forming a "homogeneous" democratic government, organising a new "cabinet" consisting of "socialist" Ministers, and, in general, "seriously changing" the composition of the Provisional Government. But that is not true. It is not at all a matter of replacing some members of the Provisional Government by others. What matters is to make the new, the revolutionary classes the masters of the country. What matters is to transfer power to the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry. But for this, a mere change of government is far from enough. What is needed, first of all, is to purge thoroughly all government departments and institutions, to expel the Kornilovites from all of them, and to place loyal members of

the working class and the peasantry everywhere. Then, and only then, will it be possible to say that power has been transferred to the Soviets "centrally and locally."

What is the reason for the notorious helplessness of the "socialist" Ministers in the Provisional Government? What is the reason for the fact that these Ministers have proved to be wretched playthings in the hands of men outside the Provisional Government (recall the "reports" Chernov and Skobelev, Zarudny and Peshekhonov made at the "Democratic Conference"!)? The reason is, first of all, that, instead of their directing their departments, their departments directed them. The reason is, among others, that every department is a fortress, in which are still entrenched bureaucrats of tsarist times who transform the pious wishes of the Ministers into an "empty sound," and who are ready to sabotage every revolutionary measure of the authorities. In order that power may pass to the Soviets actually and not nominally, those fortresses must be captured, the lackeys of the Cadet-tsarist regime must be expelled from them and replaced by elected and recallable officials loyal to the revolution.

Power to the Soviets implies a thorough purge of every government institution in the rear and at the front, from top to bottom.

Power to the Soviets implies that every "chief" in the rear and at the front must be elected and subject to recall.

Power to the Soviets implies that all "persons in authority" in town and country, in the army and navy, in "departments" and "establishments," on the railways and in post and telegraph offices must be elected and subject to recall.

Power to the Soviets means the dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry.

This dictatorship differs radically from the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie, from that dictatorship which Kornilov and Milyukov tried only very recently to establish with the benevolent help of Kerensky and Tereshchenko.

Dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry implies the dictatorship of the labouring majority over the exploiting minority, over the landlords and capitalists, the profiteers and bankers, for the sake of a democratic *peace*, for the sake of workers' *control* over production and distribution, for the sake of *land* for the peasants, for the sake of *bread* for the people.

Dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry implies an open, mass dictatorship, exercised in the sight of all, without plots and underhand dealings. For such a dictatorship has no reason to hide the fact that it will show no mercy to lockout capitalists who swell unemployment by various "unburdenings," or to profiteering bankers who force up the price of food and cause starvation.

Dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry implies a dictatorship which does not coerce the masses, a dictatorship by the will of the masses, a dictatorship for the purpose of curbing the will of the enemies of the masses.

That is the class essence of the slogan "All power to the Soviets!"

Developments in home and foreign affairs, the protracted war and the longing for peace, the defeats at the front and the need to defend the capital, the rottenness of

the Provisional Government and its projected "removal" to Moscow, economic disruption and starvation, unemployment and exhaustion—all this is irresistibly impelling the revolutionary classes of Russia to power. It means that the country is already ripe for the dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry.

The time has at last come for the revolutionary slogan "All power to the Soviets!" to be put into effect.

Rabochy Put, No. 35,
October 13, 1917
Editorial

A STUDY IN BRAZENNESS

Driven to the wall by the onslaught of the revolution, the government of bourgeois timeservers is striving to wriggle out of it by handing out false assurances that it had no intention of fleeing from Petrograd and was not thinking of surrendering the capital.

Only yesterday it was being publicly stated (*Izvestia*!) that the government was "removing" to Moscow, as it considered the position of the capital "precarious." Only yesterday there was open talk ("Defence Committee"![86]) of "surrendering" Petrograd, and the government was demanding the removal of the guns from the approaches to the capital. Only yesterday landlord Rodzyanko, the confederate of Kerensky and Kornilov in the plot against the revolution, was welcoming the government's "surrender" decision, for he wanted to see Petrograd, the navy and the Soviets perish. Only yesterday "London" was associating itself with this decision, for it wanted the government speedily to rid itself of Petrograd and the navy. All that was so only yesterday. . . . But today the panic-stricken timeservers in the government are retreating in disarray in face of the resolute determination of the navy and garrison to defend the capital and, stammering and contradicting one another, they are cravenly trying to cover

up the truth and to vindicate themselves in the eyes of the revolution, which only yesterday they were preparing, so clumsily and ineffectively, to betray.

But Kerensky's "categorical" statement that the "removal" has been postponed until the spring is refuted by Kishkin's equally categorical statement that some of the government offices "might be transferred to Moscow *now*." And B. Bogdanov, spokesman of the "Defence Committee" (who is anything but a Bolshevik!), declares just as categorically that "the government evinced a *desire to leave Petrograd*, and wide sections of the democracy perceived in the fact that the government was going the possibility that *Petrograd would be surrendered*" (*Izvestia*). This apart from the fact that according to the reports in the evening papers "the supporters of the Provisional Government's removal to Moscow had . . . a *preponderance* of votes" (*Russkiye Vedomosti*).

These miserable pigmies of the Provisional Government! They have been deceiving the people all the time. What else could they fall back on except deceiving the masses again in their attempt to cover up their disorderly retreat?

But timeservers would not be timeservers if they confined themselves to deceit. Kerensky is retreating and resorting to deception to cover up his retreat; but at the same time he hurls accusations, plainly hinting at our Party, and rants about "recrudescence of rioting," "dangerous enemies of the revolution," "blackmail," "perversion of the masses," "hands stained with the blood of innocent victims" and so on.

Kerensky denouncing "enemies of the revolution!"—Kerensky, who with Kornilov and Savinkov plotted

against the revolution and the Soviets and by fraudulent means got the Third Cavalry Corps to march on the capital. . . .

Kerensky denouncing "recrudescence of rioting"!—Kerensky, who by raising the price of bread drove the rural population to rioting and incendiarism. Read the defencist Socialist-Revolutionary *Vlast Naroda* and judge for yourselves:

"Some of our correspondents claim that the present disorders are due to the raising of the fixed prices. The new prices immediately caused a general rise in the cost of living. This is evoking discontent, resentment and excessive irritation, which make the mob more prone than before to start rioting" (No. 140).

Kerensky denouncing "perversion of the masses"!—Kerensky, who defiled the revolution and perverted its morals by reviving the secret police and political detective services with vermin like Vonlyarlyarsky and Shchukin at their head. . . .

Kerensky denouncing "blackmail"!—Kerensky, whose whole regime is one long tale of blackmailing the democracy, and who openly blackmailed the "Democratic Conference" with the false story of a military landing on the Finnish coast, in which he successfully competed with General Khabalov. . . .

Kerensky denouncing "hands stained with the blood of innocent victims"!—Kerensky, whose own hands are really stained with the innocent blood of tens of thousands of soldiers, the victims of the adventurist offensive launched at the front in June. . . .

There is a limit to everything, they say. But obviously there is no limit to the brazenness of the bourgeois timeservers. . . .

Izvestia reports that in the "Council of the Republic" Kerensky was greeted with "loud and prolonged applause from all benches." We expected nothing else from the servile Pre-parliament, that abortion of Kornilovism and godchild of Kerensky.

But be it known to these gentry, to all of them, both those who are secretly plotting reprisals against the "Lefts" and those who are applauding these reprisals in advance, that when the decisive hour strikes they will all equally be called to account by the revolution which they are seeking to betray, but which they will not succeed in hoodwinking.

Rabochy Put, No. 37,
October 15, 1917

Editorial

BLACKLEGS OF THE REVOLUTION

"The Soviets and Committees must be abolished," said Kaledin the Kornilovite at the Moscow Conference amidst the thunderous applause of the Cadets.

True, replied Tsereteli the compromiser, but it is too early yet, for "this scaffolding must not be removed before the edifice of the free revolution (i.e., counter-revolution?) is completed."

This was at the Moscow Conference in the beginning of August, when the counter-revolutionary plot of Kornilov and Rodzyanko, Milyukov and Kerensky was first taking shape.

That plot did not "come off"; the political strike of the Moscow workers thwarted it. Nevertheless, a coalition of Tsereteli and Milyukov, Kerensky and Kaledin was formed—a coalition against the Bolshevik workers and soldiers. And it turned out that the coalition was merely a screen behind which a real plot against the Soviets and Committees, against the revolution and its conquests was taking shape, a plot which came to a head at the end of August.

Could the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have known that in praising a coalition with the "virile forces" of the Moscow Conference they were working for

the Kornilov conspirators? Could the petty-bourgeois liberals of *Delo Naroda* and the trumpeters of the bourgeoisie of *Izvestia* have known that in "isolating" the Bolsheviks and undermining the Soviets and Committees they were working for counter-revolution and enrolling as blacklegs of the revolution?

The Kornilov revolt exposed all the cards. It exposed the counter-revolutionary nature of the Cadets and of the coalition with the Cadets. It revealed what a danger the alliance of the Cadets and the generals was to the revolution. It convincingly proved that had it not been for the Soviets in the rear and the Committees at the front, against which the defencists were plotting with Kaledin, the revolution would have been crushed.

We know that in the grave hour of the Kornilov revolt the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had to put themselves under the protection of those very Kronstadt sailors and "Bolshevik" Soviets and Committees against whom they had been forming a coalition with the Kaledins and the other "virile forces."

The lesson was a valuable one, and certainly impressive.

But—the memory of man is short. And particularly short is the memory of the renegades of *Izvestia* and the spineless *Delo Naroda*.

Only a little more than a month has elapsed since the Kornilov revolt. One would have thought that Kornilovism was dead and done with. But by the "will of fate" and of Kerensky we have in this short period entered a new phase of Kornilovism. Kornilov is "under arrest." But the ringleaders of Kornilovism are in power. The old coalition with the "virile forces" was disrupted. But in

its stead a new coalition with the Kornilovites has been formed. The Moscow Conference did not become the "Long Parliament" Cossack Ataman Karaulov dreamed of. But in its stead a Kornilov Pre-parliament has been constituted with the mission of "replacing the old Soviet organisation." The first conference of the Blacks in Moscow has left the scene. But in its stead a second conference of the Blacks opened in Moscow the other day, and its leader, landlord Rodzyanko, publicly declares that he *"would be glad if the Soviets and the navy perished and Petrograd were captured by the Germans."* The government makes a pretence of putting Kornilov on trial. Actually, it is paving the way for Kornilov's "advent" by conspiring with Kornilov and Kaledin, working for the withdrawal of the revolutionary troops from Petrograd, preparing to flee to Moscow, making ready to surrender Petrograd, and slobbering over "our gallant Allies," who are looking forward impatiently to the destruction of the Baltic Fleet, the capture of Petrograd by the Germans, and . . . the ascension to the throne of Sir Lavr Kornilov. . . .

Is it not evident that we are on the eve of a new wave of Kornilovism, one more ominous than the first?

Is it not evident that what is required of us now is the utmost vigilance and the fullest readiness for battle?

Is it not evident that the Soviets and revolutionary Committees are needed now more than ever?

Where lies the salvation from Kornilovism, where is the force of the revolution that is capable of crushing the impending counter-revolutionary assault with the full might of a mass movement?

Not in the servile Pre-parliament, surely!

Is it not evident that salvation lies only in the Soviets and the worker and soldier masses who stand behind them?

Is it not evident that the salvation of the revolution from the impending counter-revolution is the mission of the Soviets, and of the Soviets alone?

One would think that it was the duty of revolutionaries to cherish and strengthen these organisations, to rally the worker and peasant masses around them, to link them together in regional and all-Russian congresses.

But the *Izvestia* and *Delo Naroda* turncoats have forgotten the "severe ordeal" of the Kornilov days and for several days now have been engaged in discrediting and hounding the Soviets, in torpedoing the regional and all-Russian Soviet congresses, in disorganising and wrecking the Soviets.

"The role of the local Soviets is declining," says *Izvestia*. "The Soviets have ceased to be organisations of the whole democracy. . . .

"We want to substitute for the temporary Soviet organisation a permanent, all-round and all-embracing organisation of the structure of national and local life. When the autocracy fell and with it the whole bureaucratic system, we erected the Soviets of Deputies as temporary huts in which the entire democracy could find shelter. Now, in place of the huts, the permanent brick building of the new system is being erected, and naturally people are gradually leaving the huts for the more convenient premises as each storey is built."

Thus speaks the shameless *Izvestia*, organ of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, which is dragging on its wretched existence owing to the infinite tolerance of the Soviets.

And the Lyapkin-Tyapkins* of the spineless *Delo Naroda* hobble after *Izvestia* and profoundly opine that the Congress of Soviets must be torpedoed, for in that lies the "salvation" of the revolution and of the Constituent Assembly!

Do you hear? "Temporary organisation"—meaning the revolutionary Soviets, which overthrew tsarism and its tyranny. "Permanent and all-embracing organisation" —meaning the servile Pre-parliament, which is serving Alexeyev and Kerensky. "Temporary huts"—meaning the revolutionary Soviets, which dispersed Kornilov's detachments. "Permanent brick building"—meaning that Kornilov abortion, the Pre-parliament, whose mission it is to cover up the mobilisation of counter-revolution with its prating. Here, the hustle and bustle of virile revolutionary activity. There, the decorum and "comfort" of a counter-revolutionary chancellery. Is it surprising that the *Izvestia* and *Delo Naroda* renegades hastened to move from the "huts" of the Smolny Institute to the "brick building" of the Winter Palace, thus reducing themselves from the rank of "leaders of the revolution" to that of orderlies of Sir M. V. Alexeyev?

The Soviets must be abolished, says Sir M. V. Alexeyev.

Glad to be of service, replies *Izvestia*. You complete the last "storey" in the "brick building" of the Winter Palace, and "we," meanwhile, will tear down the "huts" of the Smolny Institute.

The Soviets must be replaced by the Pre-parliament, says Mr. Adzhemov.

* Lyapkin-Tyapkin—a character in Gogol's *Inspector-General.—Tr.*

Glad to be of service, comes the reply from *Delo Naroda*. Only first let us torpedo the Congress of Soviets.

And that is what they are doing now, on the eve of another Kornilov revolt, when the counter-revolutionaries have already convened their congress in Moscow, and when the Kornilovites have already mobilised their forces and are organising riots in the rural districts, causing starvation and unemployment in the towns, preparing to torpedo the Constituent Assembly, and openly mustering forces in the rear and at the front for another attack on the revolution.

What is that, if not downright betrayal of the revolution and its conquests?

What are they, if not despicable blacklegs of the revolution and its organisations?

How, after this, should the workers and soldiers organised in the Soviets treat these *Izvestia* and *Delo Naroda* gentry if they, in the "grave moment" of an impending Kornilov revolt turn to them "as of old" with the "outstretched hand of the beggar," pleading for protection from counter-revolution?. . .

Workers, in time of a strike, usually ride blacklegs on a wheelbarrow.

Peasants usually put blacklegs of the common cause in the pillory.

We do not doubt that the Soviets will find proper means of stigmatising the contemptible blacklegs of the revolution and its organisations.

Rabochy Put, No. 37,
October 15, 1917

Unsigned

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

October 16, 1917

The day for the uprising must be properly chosen. It is only in this sense that the resolution must be understood.[87] We must wait for the government to attack, it is said. But let us be clear what attack means. When bread prices are raised, when Cossacks are dispatched to the Donets area, etc.—that is already an attack. How long should we wait if there is no military attack? Objectively, what Kamenev and Zinoviev propose would enable the counter-revolution to prepare and organise. We would be retreating without end and would lose the revolution. Why should we not ensure for ourselves the possibility of choosing the day and the conditions for the uprising, so as to deprive the counter-revolution of the possibility of organising?

Comrade Stalin then proceeded to analyse the international situation, and argued that there must now be more confidence. There are two policies: one is heading towards the victory of the revolution and looks to Europe; the other has no faith in the revolution and counts on being only an opposition. The Petrograd Soviet has already

taken the path of insurrection by refusing to sanction the withdrawal of the troops. The navy has already risen, in so far as it has gone against Kerensky. Hence, we must firmly and irrevocably take the path of insurrection.

A Brief Minute
Made at the Plenary Meeting
of the Central Committee

"STRONG BULLS OF BASHAN HAVE BESET ME ROUND"

The Bolsheviks have issued the call—Be ready! It is necessitated by the growing tenseness of the situation and the mobilisation of the forces of counter-revolution, which wants to attack the revolution, is trying to decapitate it by surrendering the capital to Wilhelm, and intends to sap the life-blood of the capital by withdrawing the revolutionary army from it.

But the revolutionary call issued by our Party has not been understood alike by all.

The workers have understood it "in their own way," and have begun to arm. They, the workers, are far more perspicacious than many of the "clever" and "enlightened" intellectuals.

The soldiers are not lagging behind the workers. Yesterday, at a meeting of the regimental and company Committees of the garrison of the capital, they decided by a huge majority to defend with their lives the revolution and its leader, the Petrograd Soviet, at the first call of which they pledged themselves to take to arms.

That is how matters stand with the workers and soldiers.

Not so with the other sections.

The bourgeoisie know what's what. "Without wasting words," they have planted guns outside the Winter Palace, because they have their "ensigns" and "cadets," whom we hope history will not forget.

The *Dyen* and *Volya Naroda* agents of the bourgeoisie have launched a campaign against our Party, "confusing" the Bolsheviks with the Blacks, and insistently interrogating them as to the "date of the uprising."

Their understrappers, Kerensky's flunkeys, the Binasiks and Dans, have delivered themselves of a manifesto, signed by the "C.E.C.," pleading against action, demanding, like *Dyen* and *Volya Naroda*, to know the "date of the uprising," and inviting the workers and soldiers to fall on their faces before Kishkin and Konovalov.

And the terrified neurasthenics of *Novaya Zhizn* are all wrought up, because they "cannot keep silent any longer," and implore us to tell them at last when the Bolsheviks intend to take action.

Except for the workers and soldiers, verily "strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round," slandering and informing, threatening and imploring, begging and demanding.

Here is our reply.

Concerning the bourgeoisie and their "apparatus": we have a special account to settle with them.

Concerning the agents and hirelings of the bourgeoisie: we would refer them to the secret service—there they may "inform" themselves and, in turn, "inform" the proper quarters as to the "day" and "hour" of the action," the programme of which has already been charted by the agents provocateurs of *Dyen*.

Concerning the Binasiks, Dans and other orderlies of Kerensky in the Central Executive Committee: we do not render account to "heroes" who have taken the side of the Kishkin-Kerensky government against the workers, soldiers and peasants. But we shall take care that these blackleg heroes are made to render account to the Congress of Soviets, which yesterday they were trying to torpedo, but which today, bending to the pressure of the Soviets, they have been forced to convene.

As to the neurasthenics of *Novaya Zhizn*, we don't understand exactly what they want of us.

If they want to know the "day" of the uprising so as to take timely measures to mobilise the forces of the scared intellectuals for a prompt . . . flight, to Finland, say, then we can only . . . praise them, for we are in favour of mobilisation of forces "in general."

If they demand to know the "day" of the uprising in order to calm their "steel" nerves, then we can assure them that even if the "day" of the uprising were appointed, and if the Bolsheviks were to "whisper it in their ear," our neurasthenics would not be a bit the "easier" for it: there would follow new "questionings," hysterics and the like.

But if what they want is simply to stage a demonstration against us in the desire to dissociate themselves from our Party, then again we can only praise them: because, firstly, that wise step would undoubtedly be put down to their credit in the proper quarters should there be possible "complications" and "failures"; and, secondly, that would clarify the minds of the

workers and soldiers, who would at last realise that for the second time (the July days!) *Novaya Zhizn* was deserting the ranks of the revolution for the sinister cohorts of the Burtsevs and Suvorins. And we, as everyone knows, are in favour of clarity in general.

But perhaps they cannot "keep silent" because a general croaking has now been started in the marsh of our bewildered intellectuals? Does that not explain Gorky's "I cannot keep silent"? It is incredible, but a fact. They stood aside and kept silent when the landlords and their henchmen drove the peasants to desperation and hunger "riots." They stood aside and kept silent when the capitalists and their servitors were plotting a countrywide lockout of the workers and unemployment. They could keep silent when the counter-revolutionaries were attempting to surrender the capital and withdraw the army from it. But these individuals, it appears, "cannot keep silent" when the vanguard of the revolution, the Petrograd Soviet, has risen in defence of the hoodwinked workers and peasants! And the first word that comes from their lips is a rebuke levelled—not against the counter-revolution, oh no!—but against the very revolution about which they gushed with enthusiasm at the tea table, but from which, at the most crucial moment, they are fleeing as if from the plague! Is this not "strange"?

The Russian revolution has overthrown many a reputation. Its might lies, among other things, in the fact that it has not cringed before "celebrities," but has taken them into its service, or, if they refused to learn from it, has consigned them to oblivion. There is a whole string of such "celebrities" whom the

revolution has rejected—Plekhanov, Kropotkin, Breshkovskaya, Zasulich and all those old revolutionaries in general who are noteworthy only for being *old*. We fear that Gorky is envious of the laurels of these "pillars." We fear that Gorky feels a "mortal" urge to follow after them—into the museum of antiquities.

Well, every man to his own fancy. . . . The revolution is not disposed either to pity or to bury its dead. . . .

Rabochy Put, No. 41,
October 20, 1917

Unsigned

WHAT DO WE NEED?

It was the soldiers and workers who overthrew the tsar in February. But having vanquished the tsar, they had no desire to take power themselves. Led by bad shepherds, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, the workers and soldiers voluntarily turned over the power to representatives of the landlords and capitalists—the Milyukovs and Lvovs, the Guchkovs and Konovalovs.

That was a fatal mistake on the part of the victors. And for this mistake the soldiers at the front and the workers and peasants in the rear are now paying dearly.

When they overthrew the tsar the workers thought they would receive bread and work. But what they have "received" instead is high prices and starvation, lockouts and unemployment.

Why?

Because the government consists of appointees of the capitalists and profiteers, who want to starve the workers into submission.

When they overthrew the tsar the peasants thought they would receive land. But what they have "received" is arrests of their deputies and punitive expeditions.

Why?

Because the government consists of representatives of the landlords, who will never cede the land to the peasants.

When they overthrew the tsar the soldiers thought they would receive peace. But what they have "received" is a protracted war, which it is intended to prolong until next autumn.

Why?

Because the government consists of representatives of the British and French bankers, for whom a "speedy" cessation of the war is unprofitable, for whom the war is a source of ill-gotten wealth.

When they overthrew the tsar the people thought that a Constituent Assembly would be convened within two or three months. But the convocation of the Constituent Assembly has already been postponed once, and it is now obvious that the enemies are preparing to torpedo it altogether.

Why?

Because the government consists of enemies of the people, who would only lose by the prompt convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

After the victory of the February revolution, power remained in the hands of the landlords and capitalists, the bankers and speculators, the profiteers and marauders. Therein lay the fatal mistake of the workers and soldiers; that is the cause of the present disasters in the rear and at the front.

This mistake must be rectified at once. The time has come when further procrastination is fraught with disaster for the whole cause of the revolution.

The present government of landlords and capitalists must be replaced by a new government, a government of workers and peasants.

The present impostor government, which was not elected by the people and which is not accountable to the people, must be replaced by a government recognised by the people, elected by the representatives of the workers, soldiers and peasants, and accountable to these representatives.

The Kishkin-Konovalov government must be replaced by a government of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

That which was not done in February must be done now.

Thus, and thus alone, can peace, bread, land and liberty be won.

Workers, soldiers, peasants, Cossacks and all working people!

Do you want the present government of landlords and capitalists to be replaced by a new government, a government of workers and peasants?

Do you want the new government of Russia to proclaim, in conformity with the demands of the peasants, the abolition of landlordism and to transfer all the landed estates to the Peasant Committees without compensation?

Do you want the new government of Russia to publish the tsar's secret treaties, to declare them invalid, and to propose a just peace to all the belligerent nations?

Do you want the new government of Russia to put a thorough curb on the organisers of lockouts and the

profiteers who are deliberately fomenting famine and unemployment, economic disruption and high prices?

If you want this, muster all your forces, rise as one man, organise meetings and elect your delegations and, through them, lay your demands before the Congress of Soviets which opens tomorrow in the Smolny.

If you all act solidly and staunchly no one will dare to resist the will of the people. The stronger and the more organised and powerful your action, the more peacefully will the old government make way for the new. And then the whole country will boldly and firmly march forward to the conquest of peace for the peoples, land for the peasants, and bread and work for the starving.

The power must pass into the hands of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

A new government must come into power, a government elected by the Soviets, recallable by the Soviets and accountable to the Soviets.

Only such a government can ensure the timely convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

Rabochy Put, No. 44,
October 24, 1917

Editorial

NOTES

[1] The International Conference of Internationalists was held in Zimmerwald on September 5-8, 1915. It issued a manifesto characterising the world war as an imperialist war, condemning "Socialists" who voted war credits and joined bourgeois governments, and calling upon the workers of Europe to campaign against the war and for a peace without annexations or indemnities. The Internationalists held a second conference on April 24-30, 1916, in Kienthal. Its manifesto and resolutions represented a further advance in the international revolutionary movement against the war. But, like the Zimmerwald Conference, it did not endorse the Bolshevik slogans: conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war, defeat of one's own imperialist government, organisation of a Third International. p. *6*

[2] The Yedinstvo group was an organisation of extreme Right-wing Menshevik defencists, formed in March 1917. Its leading figures were Plekhanov and the former Liquidators, Buryanov and Jordansky. It unreservedly supported the Provisional Government, demanded the continuation of the imperialist war, and joined with the Black Hundreds in attacking the Bolsheviks. At the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution members of the group took part in the counter-revolutionary Committee for the Salvation of the Fatherland and the Revolution. p. *10*

[3] *Rech* (*Speech*)—a newspaper, central organ of the Cadet (Constitutional Democratic) Party, published in St. Petersburg from February 1906 to October 26, 1917. p. *20*

[4] *Dyen* (*Day*)—a newspaper founded in St. Petersburg in 1912, financed by the banks and run by the Menshevik Liquidators. It was suppressed for counter-revolutionary activities on October 26, 1917. p. *20*

[5] In connection with the interview given by Milyukov to the press, *Pravda* (No. 17, March 25, 1917) carried an editorial entitled "Down With Imperialist Policy!" analysing the foreign policy of the Provisional Government.

After the February Revolution (on March 5, 1917) *Pravda* became the Central Organ of the Bolshevik Party. On March 15, 1917, at an enlarged meeting of the Bureau of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin was appointed a member of its editorial board. On his return to Russia in April 1917, V. I. Lenin took over the direction of *Pravda*. V. M. Molotov, Y. M. Sverdlov, M. S. Olminsky and K. N. Samoilova were among the paper's regular contributors. On July 5, 1917, the *Pravda* editorial offices were wrecked by military cadets and Cossacks. When V. I. Lenin went into hiding after the July days, J. V. Stalin became the editor-in-chief of the Central Organ. On July 23, 1917, the Army Organisation of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.) managed to found a paper called *Rabochy i Soldat* (*Worker and Soldier*), and the Central Committee of the Party gave instructions that, pending the restarting of the Central Organ, *Rabochy i Soldat* should perform its functions. In the period July-October the Central Organ contributed immensely to rallying the workers and soldiers around the Bolshevik Party and in preparing the ground for an armed uprising. On August 13, 1917, the Bolshevik Central Organ began to appear under the name of *Proletary* (*Proletarian*), and, when that paper was banned, it reappeared as *Rabochy* (*Worker*), and then, until October 26, 1917, as *Rabochy Put* (*Workers' Path*). On October 27, 1917, the Bolshevik Central Organ resumed its old name—*Pravda*. p. *22*

[6] *Vecherneye Vremya* (*Evening Times*)—an evening paper of reactionary trend, founded by A. S. Suvorin, and published in St. Petersburg from 1911 to 1917. p. *23*

[7] *Delo Naroda* (*People's Cause*)—a Socialist-Revolutionary paper, published in Petrograd from March 15, 1917, to January 1918. p. *25*

[8] Sonderbund—a reactionary alliance of the seven Catholic cantons of Switzerland which was formed in 1845 and which insisted on the perpetuation of the political disunity of the country. In 1847 war broke out between the Sonderbund and the other cantons, which favoured a centralised government for Switzerland. The war ended with the defeat of the Sonderbund and the conversion of Switzerland from a union of states into an integral federal state. p. *27*

[9] The Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) was held in Petrograd on April 24-29, 1917. It was the first conference of the Bolsheviks to be held openly and legally, and it ranked as a Party congress. In a report on the current situation, V. I. Lenin developed the principles he had formulated earlier in his April Theses. J. V. Stalin made a speech at the conference in defence of V. I. Lenin's resolution on the current situation and delivered a report on the national question. The conference condemned the opportunist, capitulatory position of Kamenev, Rykov, Zinoviev, Bukharin and Pyatakov, who opposed a socialist revolution in Russia and took a national-chauvinist stand on the national question. The April Conference oriented the Bolshevik Party towards a struggle to transform the bourgeois democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. For the resolution of the April Conference on the national question, see "Resolutions and Decisions of C.P.S.U.(B.) Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums," Part I, 6th ed., 1940, p. 233. p. *31*

[10] The Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was held in Moscow, March 18-23, 1919. It vehemently denounced the chauvinist dominant-nation views of Bukharin and Pyatakov on the national question. For the Programme of the R.C.P.(B.) adopted by the Eighth Congress, see "Resolutions and Decisions of C.P.S.U.(B.) Congresses, Conferences

and Central Committee Plenums," Part I, 6th ed., 1940, pp. 281-95. p. *32*

[11] See *Second Congress of the Comintern, July-August, 1920*, Moscow, 1934, p. 492. p. *32*

[12] The text of Shingaryov's telegram was reproduced by V. I. Lenin in his article, "A 'Voluntary Agreement' Between Landlords and Peasants?" in *Pravda*, No. 33, April 15, 1917 (see V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 24, p. 108). p. *36*

[13] The All-Russian Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was convened by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and met in Petrograd from March 29 to April 3, 1917. It was dominated by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. p. *43*

[14] The Note of Milyukov, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government and leader of the Cadets, was sent to the Allied powers on April 18, 1917. It gave assurances of the fidelity of the Provisional Government to the treaties concluded by the tsarist regime and affirmed its readiness to continue the imperialist war. The Note evoked profound indignation among the workers and soldiers of Petrograd. p. *46*

[15] The Kshesinska mansion (Kshesinska had been a favourite of the tsar) was seized by the revolutionary soldiers at the time of the February Revolution and served as the premises of the Central and Petrograd Bolshevik Committees, the Army Organisation of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.), a soldiers' club and other workers' and soldiers' organisations. p. *48*

[16] On April 22, 1917, after the conference in the Mariinsky Palace, the Provisional Government published an "explanation" of Milyukov's Note, asserting that by "a decisive victory over the enemy" was meant "establishment of enduring peace on the basis of the self-determination of nations." The compromising Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of

Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies accepted the government's corrections and "explanations" as satisfactory and considered "the incident closed." p. *49*

[17] Bund—the General Jewish Workers' Union of Poland, Lithuania and Russia, founded in October 1897 (see J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 394, Note 7). p. *56*

[18] The Revolutionary People's Committee, elected at a congress of representatives of volosts and hamlets of the Schlüsselburg Uyezd, adopted measures for the solution of the land question. The Committee's Land Commission resolved: 1) that the village communities should plough up unused land belonging to churches, monasteries, the royal family and private proprietors, and 2) that the required farm implements and livestock should be taken over from private estates, warehouses, etc., at a minimum valuation. In pursuance of this decision, the volost committees took all the land in the uyezd under their control, made an inventory of implements and livestock, arranged for the guarding of woods and forests, and organised the ploughing up of unused land. p. *61*

[19] The supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda*, No. 13, May 3, 1917, contained the resolutions of the Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). p. *69*

[20] Preparations for the elections to the Petrograd district Dumas began in April 1917. *Pravda* and the Petrograd and district committees of the Bolshevik Party called upon the workers and soldiers to take an active part in the elections and to vote for the Bolshevik candidates. At a meeting of the Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on May 10, 1917, which was attended by J. V. Stalin, reports were made by city and district commissions on the progress of the election campaign. Polling continued from May 27 to June 5, 1917. The outcome of the polling was discussed by J. V. Stalin in the article "Results of the Petrograd Municipal Elections" (see p. 95 in this volume). p. *70*

[21] The Trudoviks were a group of petty-bourgeois democrats formed in April 1906 of peasant members of the First State Duma. In 1917 the Trudoviks merged with the Popular Socialist Party. p. *75*

[22] The Popular Socialists were a petty-bourgeois organisation which split off from the Right wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in 1906. Their political demands did not go beyond a constitutional monarchy. Lenin called them "Social-Cadets" and "Socialist-Revolutionary Mensheviks." After the February Revolution of 1917 the Popular Socialists were among the petty-bourgeois "socialist" parties that took up an extreme Right stand. After the October Revolution the Popular Socialists joined counter-revolutionary organisations. p. *75*

[23] *Rabochaya Gazeta* (*Workers' Newspaper*)—central organ of the Menshevik Party, founded in Petrograd on March 7, 1917. It was suppressed shortly after the October Revolution. p. *76*

[24] The Inter-Regional (Mezhrayonnaya) Organisation of United Social-Democrats, or Mezhrayontsi, was formed in St. Petersburg in 1913 and consisted of Trotskyite Mensheviks and a number of former Bolsheviks who had split away from the Party. During the First World War the Mezhrayontsi occupied a Centrist position and opposed the Bolsheviks. In 1917 they announced their agreement with the line of the Bolshevik Party, and the Bolsheviks accordingly formed a bloc with them in the elections to the Petrograd district Dumas in May 1917. The Mezhrayontsi were admitted to the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) at its Sixth Congress. A number of them, headed by Trotsky, subsequently proved to be enemies of the people. p. *78*

[25] *Novaya Zhizn* (*New Life*)—a Menshevik paper founded in Petrograd in April 1917. It was the rallying centre of Martovite Mensheviks and individual intellectuals of a semi-Menshevik trend. The *Novaya Zhizn* group continually vacillated between the

compromisers and the Bolsheviks, and after the July days members of the group held a unity congress with the Menshevik defencists. After the October Revolution the group, with the exception of a few of its members who joined the Bolsheviks, adopted a hostile attitude towards the Soviet Government. *Novaya Zhizn* was suppressed in the summer of 1918. p. *79*

[26] The First All-Russian Peasant Congress met in Petrograd from May 4 to 28, 1917. The majority of the delegates belonged to the Socialist-Revolutionary Party or kindred groups. The overwhelming number of the delegates from the gubernias represented the rich peasants, the kulaks. p. *85*

[27] Declaration of Rights of the Soldier—an order of the day issued to the army and navy by Kerensky, War Minister in the Provisional Government, on May 11, 1917, defining the basic rights of servicemen. It substantially curtailed the rights won by the soldiers in the early days of the February revolution. The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet welcomed the declaration, but the soldiers and sailors held meetings of protest and called it a "declaration of no rights." p. *85*

[28] *Vechernyaya Birzhovka*—contemptuous nickname given to the evening edition of the *Birzheviye Vedomosti* (*Stock Exchange News*), a bourgeois paper founded in St. Petersburg in 1880. The nickname "Birzhovka" became a synonym of the unprincipled and corrupt press. The paper was suppressed at the end of October 1917 by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. p. *86*

[29] Robert Grimm, secretary of the Swiss Socialist Party, had come to Russia in May 1917. Early in June a report appeared in the bourgeois papers alleging that Grimm had been assigned the mission of probing the possibility of a separate peace between Germany and Russia. The Provisional Government made this a pretext for expelling him from Russia. p. *89*

[30] The First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, sponsored and arranged by the Petrograd Soviet, was held on June 3-24, 1917. The majority of the delegates were Socialist-Revolutionaries (285) and Mensheviks (248). The Bolsheviks, who at that time were in the minority in the Soviets, were represented by 105 delegates. At the congress, the Bolsheviks exposed the imperialist character of the war and the disastrousness of compromise with the bourgeoisie. V. I. Lenin spoke on the attitude towards the Provisional Government and, in another speech, on the war. In opposition to the compromising stand of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, he demanded the transfer of all power to the Soviets. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were the dominating influence at the congress. p. *93*

[31] *Volya Naroda* (*People's Will*)—a newspaper, organ of the Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries, published in Petrograd from April 29 to November 24, 1917. p. *98*

[32] "To All the Toilers, to All the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd" was written in connection with the demonstration of workers and soldiers called by the Central Committee and Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) for June 10, 1917. It was first published on June 9 as a proclamation which was distributed in the districts of Petrograd. It was to have appeared in *Pravda* and *Soldatskaya Pravda* on June 10, but since the Bolshevik Central Committee and Petrograd Committee had been obliged on the night before to call off the demonstration, the appeal was cut out of the stereotypes. Only a few copies of *Soldatskaya Pravda* appeared with the text of the appeal. On June 13 it was published in *Pravda*, No. 80, following an article entitled "The Truth About the Demonstration," and again in *Pravda* of June 17 and 18, in connection with the new demonstration appointed for the latter day. p. *101*

[33] *Okopnaya Pravda* (*Trench Truth*)—a Bolshevik paper published in Riga, the first issue appearing on April 30, 1917. The paper was initially published by the Soldiers' Committee of the Novo-Ladoga Regiment with funds contributed by the soldiers themselves, but beginning with its seventh issue (May 17, 1917) it became the organ of the Army Organisation and Russian Section of the Riga Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). Later (beginning with its 26th issue, July 5) it became the organ of the Twelfth Army Organisation of the Riga Committee, and then of the Central Committee of the Latvian Social-Democratic Party. *Okopnaya Pravda* was suppressed on July 21, 1917, but two days later, July 23, another paper appeared in its place, *Okopny Nabat* (*Trench Alarm*), organ of the Joint Army Organisation of the Latvian Social-Democratic Party, and continued publication until Riga was captured by the Germans. *Okopny Nabat* resumed publication in Venden on October 12, and on October 29 it resumed its former name—*Okopnaya Pravda*. From then on it appeared regularly until February 1918. p. *106*

[34] *Soldatskaya Pravda* (*Soldiers' Truth*)—a Bolshevik newspaper which began publication on April 15, 1917, as the organ of the Army Organisation of the Petrograd Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.), and from May 19 as the organ of the Army Organisation of the Central Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.). The newspaper was extremely popular among the Petrograd soldiers and workers. Workers voluntarily contributed funds for its maintenance and free distribution among the soldiers at the front. Its circulation rose to 50,000 copies, half of which went to the front. During the July days the editorial offices of *Soldatskaya Pravda* were wrecked, together with those of *Pravda*, and the paper was suppressed by the Provisional Government. It resumed publication a few days after the October Revolution and continued till March 1918. p. *111*

[35] The Trud printing plant, where the Bolshevik newspapers and books were printed, had been acquired by the Central Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on April 22, 1917, with funds

contributed, in response to *Pravda*'s appeal, by the workers and soldiers themselves. On July 6, 1917, the plant was wrecked by military cadet and Cossack detachments. p. *111*

[36] The Second (Emergency) Petrograd City Conference of the Bolshevik Party convened on July 1, 1917, and was attended by 145 delegates, representing 32,220 Party members. The emergency conference was necessitated by the acute political situation that had arisen in Petrograd and the country generally in connection with the offensive launched at the front, the attempts of the Provisional Government to withdraw the revolutionary regiments from Petrograd and "unburden" the city of revolutionary workers, etc. The conference adjourned owing to the events of July 3-5 and resumed its sittings only on July 16, its deliberations from then on being directed by J. V. Stalin. p. *114*

[37] The Extraordinary Conference in Moscow, or the Moscow Conference of State, was convened by the Provisional Government on August 12, 1917. The majority of the participants were landlords, bourgeois, generals, officers and Cossack commanders. The delegates from the Soviets and the Central Executive Committee were Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. At the conference, Kornilov, Alexeyev, Kaledin and others outlined a programme for the suppression of the revolution. Kerensky, in his speech, threatened to crush the revolutionary movement and to put a stop to the attempts of the peasants to seize the landed estates. In an appeal written by J. V. Stalin, the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party called upon the proletariat to protest against the Moscow Conference. On the day of its opening the Bolsheviks organised a one-day strike in Moscow, in which over 400,000 workers took part. Protest meetings and strikes took place in a number of other cities. The counter-revolutionary character of the Moscow Conference was exposed by J. V. Stalin in a number of articles (see present volume, pp. 207, 215, 226, 231, etc.). p. *119*

[38] The delegates from the Baltic Fleet had come to Petrograd from Helsingfors on July 5, 1917, in connection with the attempt of the Provisional Government to use Baltic warships against the revolutionary sailors of Kronstadt who had taken an active part in the demonstration of July 3-4 in Petrograd. On July 7, the 67 delegates from the Baltic Fleet were arrested by order of the Provisional Government. p. *119*

[39] The Sestroretsk workers were disarmed on July 11, 1917, by order of the Provisional Government and with the consent of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Central Executive Committee. The workers were presented with an ultimatum to surrender their weapons under threat of armed force. The Bolshevik members of the factory committee of the Sestroretsk small arms factory were arrested. p. *119*

[40] The Provisional Government's declaration of July 8, 1917, contained a number of demagogic promises, with which the Provisional Government and the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks hoped to appease the masses after the events of July 3-5. The government called for the continuation of the imperialist war, but at the same time promised to hold the elections to the Constituent Assembly on the appointed date, September 17, and to frame laws introducing an 8-hour working day, social insurance, etc. Although the declaration of July 8 was nothing but a formal gesture, it was attacked by the Cadets, who made its withdrawal a condition of their entering the government. p. *125*

[41] Kamkovites—followers of B. Kamkov (Kats), a leader of the Left wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party which took shape soon after the February Revolution of 1917. p. *129*

[42] The article "Victory of the Counter-revolution" had been originally printed in the Kronstadt *Proletarskoye Delo* (*Proletarian Cause*), No. 5, July 19, 1917, under the title "Triumph of the Counter-revolution." p. *138*

[43] The words of Mulei Hassan, the Moor of Tunis in Schiller's tragedy "Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua." p. *142*

[44] Arthur Henderson—one of the leaders of the British Labour Party; a social-chauvinist and member of Lloyd George's government during the First World War.

Albert Thomas—one of the leaders of the French Socialist Party; in the First World War he was a social-chauvinist and a member of the French government. p. *142*

[45] The appeal, "To All the Toilers, to All the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd," was written in connection with the events of July 3-5 at the request of the Second Petrograd City Conference of the Bolshevik Party. It was printed in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 2, July 25 (the date was erroneously given on the first page of the paper as July 24). It was reprinted in the No.8 issue on August 1 at the request of the workers and soldiers. p. *145*

[46] The "historic conference," as it was called by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, was convened by the Provisional Government on July 21 in connection with the government crisis resulting from the withdrawal of the Cadet Ministers from the government and Kerensky's announcement of his resignation. At the conference, which consisted of representatives of the bourgeois and compromising parties, the Cadets demanded the formation of a government which would be independent of the Soviets and the democratic parties, capable of restoring "discipline" in the army with the help of repressive measures, etc. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks acquiesced in these demands and empowered Kerensky to form a new Provisional Government. p. *148*

[47] The two conferences were the Emergency Petrograd City Conference of the Bolsheviks, held July 1-3 and 16-20, 1917 (see Note 36), and the Second City Conference of the Mensheviks, held July 15-16. p. *153*

[48] The elections to the Constituent Assembly had been fixed by the Provisional Government for September 17, 1917, and the article "The Constituent Assembly Elections" was written in connection with the opening of the election campaign. The first part of the article appeared in *Pravda*, No. 99, July 5, but was not continued because the paper was suppressed after the July days. The article was printed in full only on July 27, in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 4. p. *158*

[49] The All-Russian Peasants' Union was a petty-bourgeois organisation which arose in 1905 and demanded political liberty, a Constituent Assembly and the abolition of private ownership of land. It disintegrated in 1906, but resumed its activities in 1917, and on July 31 convened an All-Russian Congress in Moscow. The congress declared its unqualified support of the Provisional Government, favoured continuation of the imperialist war, and opposed the seizure of the landed estates by the peasants. In the autumn of 1917 several members of the Central Committee of the Peasants' Union took part in repressing peasant uprisings. p. *158*

[50] The Soviet of Peasants' Deputies of the Petrograd Garrison, which later changed its name to the Petrograd Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, was constituted on April 14, 1917, from representatives of the military units and some of the industrial plants of Petrograd. Its chief object was to secure the transfer of the tenure of all land to the peasants without compensation. It opposed the compromising policy of the All-Russian Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, which was controlled by Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries. After the October Socialist Revolution the Petrograd Soviet of Peasants' Deputies took an active part in the establishment of Soviet rule in the countryside and in the implementation of the Decree on the Land. The Soviet terminated its existence in February 1918 with the demobilisation of the old army. p. *161*

[51] The Sixth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) was held in Petrograd from July 26 to August 3, 1917. It heard and

discussed the Central Committee's reports on policy and organisation, reports from the districts, on the war and the international situation, on the political and economic situation, on the trade union movement, and on the Constituent Assembly election campaign. The congress adopted new Party Rules and resolved to form a Youth League. The report of the Central Committee and the report on the political situation were made by J. V. Stalin. The congress rejected the Trotskyite resolutions of Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, which were designed to divert the Party from the course of socialist revolution, and approved the resolution on the political situation submitted by J. V. Stalin. The congress headed the Party for armed uprising, for the socialist revolution. p. *166*

52 Friedrich Adler—a leader of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party. In 1916, in token of protest against the war, he assassinated the Austrian Prime Minister, Stürgkh, for which he was sentenced to death in May 1917, but was released in 1918. On emerging from prison he took up a hostile attitude towards the October Revolution in Russia. p. *167*

53 On July 4, 1917, the following leaflet was distributed in the working-class quarters of Petrograd:

"Comrade Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd, now that the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie has clearly come out in opposition to the revolution, let the All-Russian Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies take the entire power into its own hands.

"This is the will of the revolutionary population of Petrograd, and it has the right to make its will known through a *peaceful* and *organised* demonstration to the Executive Committees of the All-Russian Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies now in session.

"Long live the will of the revolutionary workers and revolutionary soldiers!

"Long live the power of the Soviets!

"The coalition government is bankrupt: it has fallen to pieces without having been able to perform the tasks for

which it was formed. Gigantic and most difficult problems confront the revolution. A new power is needed which will, in conjunction with the revolutionary proletariat, the revolutionary army and the revolutionary peasantry, resolutely set about consolidating and extending the peoples' conquests. This power can only be that of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

"Yesterday, the revolutionary garrison of Petrograd and the workers came out to proclaim: 'All power to the Soviet!' We urge that this movement that has broken out in the regiments and the factories should be turned into a peaceful and organised expression of the will of all the workers, soldiers and peasants of Petrograd.

"Central Committee, R.S.D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee, R.S.D.L.P.
Mezhrayonny Committee, R.S.D.L.P.
Army Organisation of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.
Commission of the Workers' Section, Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies." p. *174*

54 *Listok Pravdy* (*Pravda Bulletin*) appeared on July 6, 1917, in place of *Pravda*, whose editorial offices had been wrecked by military cadets. It carried an appeal of the Central and Petrograd Committees and the Army Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), under the title: "Calm and Restraint." p. *176*

55 *Zhivoye Slovo* (*Living Word*)—a yellow ultra-reactionary newspaper published in Petrograd. In 1917 it called for violent action against the Bolsheviks. It ceased publication with the October Revolution. p. *177*

56 The leaflet "Try the Slanderers!" was issued by the Central Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.) after July 5, 1917, and was printed on July 9 in *Volna* (*Wave*), a newspaper published by the Helsingfors Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). The leaflet said: "The counter-revolutionaries want to decapitate the revolution by a very simple means, by confusing the minds of the masses and

inciting them against their most popular leaders, the tried and tested champions of the revolution. . . . We demand that the Provisional Government and the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies institute *an immediate public inquiry* into all the circumstances of the vile plot of the pogromists and hired slanderers against the honour and lives of the leaders of the working class. . . . The slanderers and slandermongers must be brought to trial. The pogromists and liars must be pilloried!" p. *178*

57 Bezrabotny—pseudonym of D. Z. Manuilsky. p. *181*

58 On July 27, 1917, troop trains of the Ukrainian Bogdan Khmelnitsky Regiment which were proceeding to the front were fired upon by Cossacks and cuirassiers at stations near Kiev and in Kiev itself. p. *187*

59 Order No.1 had been issued on March 1, 1917, by the Petrograd Soviet on the demand of representatives of the revolutionary military units, who reported that the soldiers were growing increasingly distrustful of the Provisional Committee of the State Duma and its Military Commission.

The Order directed the military units (companies, battalions, etc.) to elect Soldiers' Committees and to appoint representatives to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, commanded that the weapons of the military units be placed at the disposal of the Soldiers' Committees, sanctioned the carrying out of the orders of the Military Commission only when they did not run counter to the orders and decisions of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, etc. p. *192*

60 J. V. Stalin is referring to Lenin's pamphlet, *On Slogans*, written in July 1917 (see V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 25, p. 164). p. *196*

61 The article "Against the Moscow Conference" was written by J. V. Stalin at the request of the Central Committee of the

R.S.D.L.P.(B.) which had discussed the question of the Moscow Conference on August 5, 1917. The C.C. resolved to publish its resolution and a leaflet and to print a series of articles on the Moscow Conference in the Central Organ. "Against the Moscow Conference" first appeared as an editorial in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 14, and then in the Kronstadt *Proletarskoye Delo* on August 12, 1917, and, on August 13, as an appeal of the Party Central Committee in *Proletary*, No. 1. It was also put out as a separate leaflet.

In the appeal and the leaflet the last few lines were replaced by the following words:

"Comrades,arrange meetings and pass resolutions of protest against the 'Moscow Conference'! As a mark of protest against the 'Conference,' join with the Putilov workers today in organising collections in support of the hounded and persecuted Party press. Do not succumb to provocation and do not arrange any street demonstrations today!" p. *207*

62 The idea of convening a conference in Stockholm to discuss the question of peace had been mooted in April 1917. Borgbjerg, a Danish Social-Democrat, had come to Petrograd on behalf of the Joint Committee of the labour parties of Denmark, Norway and Sweden to invite the Russian socialist parties to take part in the conference. The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Executive Committee and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies resolved to participate in the conference and to take the initiative in convening it. The Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the Bolshevik Party exposed the imperialist character of the projected Stockholm Conference and resolutely declared against participating in it. When the question of the conference was discussed at a meeting of the Central Executive Committee on August 6, Kamenev spoke urging participation. The Bolshevik members of the Central Executive Committee dissociated themselves from Kamenev's statement. The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party condemned his attitude and resolved that the views of the Party on the question should be expounded in the Central Organ. On August 9,

Rabochy i Soldat printed Stalin's article "More on the Subject of Stockholm," and on August 16 *Proletary* published a letter from V. I. Lenin entitled "Kamenev's Speech in the Central Executive Committee on the Stockholm Conference." p. *211*

63 The Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies had decided in April 1917 to send a delegation to neutral and allied countries to make arrangements for the Stockholm Conference. The decision was confirmed by the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The delegation visited England, France, Italy and Sweden and negotiated with representatives of various socialist parties. The Stockholm Conference never took place. p. *211*

64 Long Parliament—the parliament at the time of the bourgeois revolution in England in the seventeenth century which sat for thirteen years (1640-53). p. *216*

65 The Preliminary Conference, or "Private Conference of Public Men" as it was otherwise called, met in Moscow from August 8 to 10, 1917. Its object was to unite the bourgeoisie, landlords and military and to draft a joint programme for the forthcoming Conference of State. At the conference a counter-revolutionary Union of Public Men was set up. p. *218*

66 The Finnish Diet, convoked towards the close of March 1917, demanded autonomy for Finland. On July 5, 1917, after long and fruitless negotiations with the Provisional Government, the Diet passed a Supreme Powers Law, extending the authority of the Diet to all Finnish affairs except foreign policy, military legislation and military administration, which were to be under the jurisdiction of the all-Russian authorities. On July 18, 1917, the Provisional Government dissolved the Diet on the grounds that in passing this law before the Constituent Assembly had expressed its will, it had usurped the latter's authority. p. *222*

67 The Ukrainian Central Rada had been formed in April 1917 by Ukrainian bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and groups. On the eve of the July days a General Secretariat of the Rada was instituted as the supreme administrative authority in the Ukraine. After the dispersal of the July demonstration in Petrograd, the Provisional Government, in pursuance of its policy of national oppression, severed the Donets Basin and the Yekaterinoslav and several other Ukrainian regions from the Ukraine. Supreme authority in the Ukraine was vested in a Commissar appointed by the Provisional Government. Notwithstanding this, the Rada leaders, out of fear of the approaching proletarian revolution, soon came to terms with the Provisional Government, and the Rada became a stronghold of bourgeois nationalist counter-revolution in the Ukraine. p. *222*

68 *Izvestia (Gazette) of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies* was a newspaper which began publication on February 28, 1917. It became the organ of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies when the latter was constituted at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, and, beginning with its 132nd issue (August 1, 1917), appeared under the name of *Izvestia of the Central Executive Committee and Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.* The paper was controlled by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and conducted a bitter fight against the Bolshevik Party, but on October 27, 1917, after the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, it became the official organ of the Soviet Government. In March 1918 its editorial offices were transferred from Petrograd to Moscow when the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars removed to the latter city. p. *228*

69 On August 19, 1917, the German army began operations for piercing the Russian front at Riga. The Russian troops put up vigorous resistance, but the supreme command, represented by Kornilov, ordered a retreat, and on August 21 Riga was

occupied by the Germans. The city was surrendered by Kornilov in order to create a threat to revolutionary Petrograd, secure the withdrawal of the revolutionary army units from that city, and thus facilitate the plot against the revolution. p. *229*

[70] *Novoye Vremya* (*New Times*)—an organ of the reactionary aristocratic and government bureaucratic circles, founded in St. Petersburg in 1868. In 1905 it became one of the organs of the Black Hundreds. It was suppressed in the latter part of October 1917. p. *234*

[71] *Russkiye Vedomosti* (*Russian News*)—a newspaper representing the interests of the liberal landlords and bourgeois, founded in Moscow in 1863. It was suppressed, together with other counter-revolutionary papers, in 1918. p. *250*

[72] In 1894 French reactionaries brought a false charge of espionage and high treason against Dreyfus, a Jewish officer of the French General Staff. He was court-martialled and sentenced to life imprisonment. The public movement in defence of Dreyfus which developed in France disclosed the corruptness of the court and exacerbated the political struggle between the republicans and monarchists. Dreyfus was pardoned and released in 1899. The case was reviewed in 1906 and he was exonerated. p. *266*

[73] *The Times*—a London daily, founded in 1788, influential organ of the British big bourgeoisie. p. *267*

[74] *Le Matin*—a bourgeois daily, founded in Paris in 1884. p. *267*

[75] The article "Either—Or" had been printed in slightly abbreviated form in *Proletary*, No. 10, August 24, 1917, under the title "What Is the Way Out?" p. *271*

[76] *Russkaya Volya* (*Russian Will*)—a bourgeois newspaper, financed by the big banks, published in Petrograd from December 15, 1916, to October 25, 1917. p. *274*

[77] The article "The Conspiracy Continues" appeared in *Rabochy*, No. 5, August 28, 1917, in a second, special one-page issue of the paper put out in connection with the Kornilov revolt. The article was reprinted the next day in *Rabochy* (No. 6, August 29) under the heading "Political Comments." p. *282*

[78] *Le Temps*—a bourgeois daily published in Paris from 1829 to 1842 and from 1861 to 1942. p. *309*

[79] The resolution of the Petrograd Soviet was published in *Rabochy Put*, No. 21, September 27, 1917. p. *335*

[80] The railway strike lasted from September 24 to 26, 1917. The railway employees demanded pay increases, an eight-hour day and better food supplies. The strike spread to all the railways in the country and had the sympathy and support of the industrial workers. p. *336*

[81] The Declaration of August 14 was announced as the programme of the so-called "revolutionary democracy" by Chkheidze at the Moscow Conference of State on behalf of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik majorities in the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Executive Committee of the All-Russian Soviet of Peasants' Deputies and other organisations. It urged support of the Provisional Government. p. *339*

[82] Lieberdanists (or Lieberdans)—the contemptuous nickname for the Menshevik leaders Lieber and Dan and their followers coined by the poet Demyan Bedny in a skit printed in the Moscow Bolshevik paper *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 141, August 25, 1917, entitled "Lieberdan." The nickname clung. p. *339*

[83] *Torgovo-Promyshlennaya Gazeta* (*Trade and Industrial News*)—a bourgeois newspaper published in St. Petersburg from 1893 to 1918. p. *340*

[84] *Obshcheye Delo* (*Common Cause*)—an evening daily newspaper published in Petrograd in September and October 1917 by V. Burtsev. It supported Kornilov and conducted a frenzied campaign of calumny against the Soviets and the Bolsheviks. p. *349*

[85] The Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, at which uyezd and gubernia Soviets of Peasants' Deputies were represented, opened in Petrograd on October 25, 1917. It held two sessions in all—on the 25th and the 26th. There were 649 delegates present at the opening. The largest group were the Bolsheviks, with 390 delegates. The Mensheviks, Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries and Bundists left the congress soon after it opened, refusing to recognise the socialist revolution.

The Second Congress of Soviets proclaimed the transfer of power to the Soviets and set up the first Soviet Government—the Council of People's Commissars. V. I. Lenin was elected Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, and J. V. Stalin People's Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities. p. *385*

[86] The Defence Committee, or Executive Committee for National Defence, had been set up at a conference on defence convened by the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on August 7, 1917. The Defence Committee supported the military measures adopted by the Provisional Government in the interests of the bourgeois and landlord counter-revolution (withdrawal of the revolutionary troops from Petrograd, etc.). p. *397*

[87] The reference is to the resolution drafted by V. I. Lenin and adopted by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on October 10, 1917 (see V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 26, p. 162). p. *407*

BIOGRAPHICAL CHRONICLE

(*March-October 1917*)

March 12 — J. V. Stalin, released by the February Revolution from exile in Turukhansk, arrives in Petrograd.

March 14 — J. V. Stalin's article "The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" appears in *Pravda*, No. 8.

March 15 — At an enlarged meeting of the Bureau of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin is appointed to the editorial board of *Pravda*.

March 16 — J. V. Stalin's article "The War" appears in *Pravda*, No. 10.

March 18 — The Bureau of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.) delegates J. V. Stalin to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

J. V. Stalin's article "Conditions for the Victory of the Russian Revolution" appears in *Pravda*, No. 12.

April 3 — At Byelo-Ostrov Station, Finland Railway, J. V. Stalin, M. I. Ulyanova and a delegation of Petrograd and Sestroretsk working men and women meet V. I. Lenin on his return from exile and accompany him to Petrograd.

April 4 — J. V. Stalin takes part in the conference of leading members of the Bolshevik Party and in the joint meeting of Bolshevik and Menshevik

delegates to the All-Russian Conference of Soviets where V. I. Lenin expounds his April Theses.

April 6 — J. V. Stalin speaks in the debate on V.I. Lenin's April Theses at a meeting of the Bureau of the Party Central Committee.

April 8 — J. V. Stalin signs a declaration of protest against the decision of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet supporting the so-called Liberty Loan.

April 14 — J. V. Stalin's article "The Land to the Peasants" appears in *Pravda*, No. 32.

April 14-22 — J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).

April 18 — J. V. Stalin delivers a speech on "The Provisional Government" at a May Day meeting on Stock Exchange Square, Vasilyevsky Ostrov, Petrograd.

J. V. Stalin's article "May Day" appears in *Pravda*, No. 35.

April 20 — As a member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, J. V. Stalin attends the conference of members of the Provisional Government and the Provisional Committee of the State Duma with representatives of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies convened in the Mariinsky Palace in connection with Milyukov's Note of April 18.

April 24-29 — V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin guide the work of the Seventh (April) All-Russian Conference of the Bolshevik Party.

April 24 — J. V. Stalin speaks at the conference in support of Lenin's resolution on the current situation and is elected to the commission appointed to draft a resolution on V. I. Lenin's report.

April 29 — J. V. Stalin makes a report on the national question at the conference and replies to the discussion. He is elected to the Central Committee of the Party.

May 4 — J. V. Stalin's article "Lagging Behind the Revolution" appears in *Pravda*, No. 48.

May 10 — J. V. Stalin speaks at a meeting of the Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on the organisational structure of the Committee and on the municipal elections.

May 14 — J. V. Stalin speaks on the national question at a meeting and concert arranged by the Estonian Workers' and Soldiers' Club in the Stock Exchange on Vasilyevsky Ostrov.

May 21, 24, 26 — J. V. Stalin's article "The Municipal Election Campaign" appears in *Pravda*, Nos. 63, 64 and 66.

May — A Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party is instituted, to which J. V. Stalin is elected, and of which he has remained a member ever since.

June 3-24 — J. V. Stalin attends the sittings of the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

June 6 — At an enlarged meeting of the Central Committee, J. V. Stalin supports a proposal moved by V. I. Lenin to organise a peaceful demonstration of workers and soldiers.

J. V. Stalin makes a survey of the political situation in Petrograd at a private meeting of the Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) devoted to the question of the demonstration.

Night of June 9 V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin attend a meeting of the Bolshevik group of the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, and then a meeting of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.). On the motion of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, the C.C. resolves to call off the demonstration appointed for June 10.

Late that night V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin prepare the copy for *Pravda* and the directives of the Central Committee in connection with the latter's decision to cancel the demonstration.

June 13 J. V. Stalin's article "Yesterday and Today (Crisis of the Revolution)" appears in *Soldatskaya Pravda*, No. 42.

June 15 J. V. Stalin's article "Results of the Petrograd Municipal Elections" appears in *Bulletin of the Press Bureau of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.*, No.1.

June 16-23 V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin direct the All-Russian Conference of Front and Rear Army Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).

June 17 J. V. Stalin greets the All-Russian Conference of Front and Rear Army Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party.

The appeal of the Central Committee and Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), "To All the Toilers, to All the Workers and Soldiers of Pertograd," written by J. V. Stalin, appears in *Pravda*, No. 84.

June 20 — The First All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin a member of the Central Executive Committee.

June 21 — J. V. Stalin makes a report at the All-Russian Conference of Front and Rear Army Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on "The National Movement and National Regiments." The conference approves a resolution on the national question moved by J. V. Stalin.

June 22 — At a meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Bolshevik group elects J. V. Stalin to the Bureau of the C.E.C.

At a private conference of members of the Central Committee, Petrograd Committee and Army Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin reports on a statement lodged with the Central Executive Committee by the Bolshevik group demanding vigorous measures against the growing counter-revolution.

July 1-3 and 16-20 — J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov direct the Second (Emergency) Conference of the Petrograd organisation of the Bolshevik Party.

July 3 — Under J. V. Stalin's guidance, the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party adopts a number of measures to restrain the masses from spontaneous armed demonstration. When it becomes clear that the movement cannot be stopped, the C.C. resolves to take part in the demonstration in order to lend it a peaceful and organised character.

July 4 — At a meeting of the Central Executive Committee, J. V. Stalin demands that the spread

of calumnies against V. I. Lenin and the Bolsheviks be stopped.

July 6 J. V. Stalin goes to the Fortress of Peter and Paul and succeeds in persuading the revolutionary sailors to refrain from armed action. J. V. Stalin secures the cancellation of the order issued by the Petrograd Military Command to employ armed force against the sailors.

July 7-8 J. V. Stalin and G. K. Ordjonikidze confer with V. I. Lenin on the question of his leaving Petrograd.

July 8-11 J.V. Stalin makes preparations for V.I. Lenin's departure from Petrograd.

July 11 J. V. Stalin and S. Y. Alliluyev accompany V. I. Lenin to Primorsk Station and put him on the train to Razliv.

July 11-October 7 J. V. Stalin maintains close contact with V. I. Lenin in hiding, and, on his instructions, personally directs the activities of the Bolshevik Central Committee.

July 15 J. V. Stalin's article "Close the Ranks!" appears in the Kronstadt *Proletarskoye Delo*, No. 2.

July 16 J. V. Stalin makes the Central Committee's report on the July events at the morning session of the Second (Emergency) Conference of the Petrograd organisation of the R.S.D.L.P. (B.), and a report on the current situation and replies to the discussion at the evening session.

July 20 J. V. Stalin speaks at the conference in the debate on the elections to the Petrograd

Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and on other questions.

July 20-23 J. V. Stalin writes the appeal "To All the Toilers, to All the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd," which is printed in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 2.

July 23 J. V. Stalin's articles "What Has Happened?" and "Victory of the Counter-revolution" appear in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 1.

July 26-August 3 J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov direct the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party.

July 27 J. V. Stalin makes the Central Committee's report at the congress and replies to the discussion.

July 30 J. V. Stalin delivers a report on the political situation at the congress.

July 31 J. V. Stalin answers questions put by a group of congress delegates and replies to the discussion on the political situation.

July 31-August 3 J. V. Stalin directs the work of the commission set up by the Sixth Congress to draft the resolution on the political situation.

August 3 J. V. Stalin submits the resolution on the political situation to the congress.

J. V. Stalin is elected a member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party.

August 4 At a plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee J. V. Stalin is appointed editor of *Rabochy i Soldat*.

August 5 — The plenary meeting of the C.C. elects J. V. Stalin a member of the Small Central Committee.

August 6 — J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Small Central Committee at which a resolution of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.(B.) on the Moscow Conference is endorsed.

August 8 — J. V. Stalin's article "Against the Moscow Conference" appears in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No.14.

August 9 — J. V. Stalin's article "More on the Subject of Stockholm" appears in *Rabochy i Soldat*, No. 15.

August 13 — At the request of the Central Committee, J. V. Stalin organises the publication of *Proletary* as the Party's Central Organ.

J. V. Stalin's article "Counter-revolution and the Peoples of Russia" appears in *Proletary*, No. 1.

August 16 — The Central Committee appoints J. V. Stalin to a commission set up to draft a resolution on the Stockholm Conference.

August 17 — J. V. Stalin delivers a lecture to soldiers on "The Social-Democrats and the City Elections" in the premises of the Narva District Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).

August 18 — J. V. Stalin's articles "The Truth About Our Defeat at the Front" and "The Causes of the July Defeat at the Front" appear in *Proletary*, No. 5.

August 22 — J.V. Stalin's article "A Period of Provocation" appears in *Proletary*, No. 8.

August 25 — J. V. Stalin's article "Either—Or" appears in *Rabochy*, No. 1.

August 27 — A resolution of the Bolshevik group on the political situation, drafted by J. V. Stalin, is read out at a meeting of the Central Executive Committee.

August 28 — J. V. Stalin's article "We Demand!" appears in *Rabochy*, No. 4.

August 30 — J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Party Central Committee at which measures against Kornilov's counter-revolutionary action are discussed.

August 31 — J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Central Committee which discusses a declaration on the question of power. J. V. Stalin is instructed to give a survey of the political situation at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee.

J.V.Stalin's article "Against Compromise With the Bourgeoisie" appears in *Rabochy*, No. 9.

August-October — J. V. Stalin edits the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), which appears successively under the names *Proletary*, *Rabochy*, and *Rabochy Put*.

September 6 — J. V. Stalin's article "They Will Not Swerve From Their Path" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 3.

September 9 — J. V. Stalin's article "The Second Wave" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 6.

September 15 — At a meeting of the Central Committee of the Party, J. V. Stalin opposes Kamenev's demand

that V. I. Lenin's letters, "The Bolsheviks Must Assume Power" and "Marxism and Insurrection," should be burned, and recommends that they should be circulated for discussion among the bigger Party organisations.

September 17 J. V. Stalin's article "All Power to the Soviets!" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 13.

September 21 At a meeting of the Bolshevik group at the Democratic Conference, J. V. Stalin insists on the observance of V. I. Lenin's directive to boycott the Pre-parliament.

September 23 The Party Central Committee approves the list of Bolshevik candidates to the Constituent Assembly, which includes V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin.

September 27 J. V. Stalin's article "A Government of Bourgeois Dictatorship" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 21.

September 28 J. V. Stalin delivers a speech on the Democratic Conference at a meeting of Bolsheviks of the Vasilyevsky Ostrov District.

September 29 The Party Central Committee decides to publish a list of candidates to the Constituent Assembly. J. V. Stalin is nominated for the Petrograd, Yekaterinoslav, Transcaucasian and Stavropol electoral areas.

J. V. Stalin's article "You Will Wait in Vain!" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 23.

October 5 At a meeting of the Central Committee it is resolved on Stalin's motion to call a conference of members of the Central Committee

and Petrograd and Moscow Party functionaries to take place at the time of the Congress of Soviets of the Northern Region.

October 8 — J. V. Stalin discusses preparations for an armed uprising with V. I. Lenin, who has secretly returned to Petrograd.

October 10 — V.I. Lenin and J.V.Stalin attend a meeting of the Party Central Committee where V.I.Lenin's resolution on armed insurrection is approved and a seven-man Political Bureau of the C.C., headed by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, is set up to direct the uprising.

J. V. Stalin's article "The Counter-revolution Is Mobilising—Prepare To Resist!" appears in *Rabochy Put*, No. 32.

October 15 — J. V. Stalin's articles "A Study in Brazenness" and "Blacklegs of the Revolution" appear in *Rabochy Put*, No. 37.

October 16 — V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin direct an enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. J. V. Stalin sharply criticises the speeches of the traitors Kamenev and Zinoviev on the question of armed insurrection. A Party Centre, headed by J. V. Stalin, is elected to direct the uprising.

October 20 — At a meeting of the Party Central Committee, J. V. Stalin proposes that V. I. Lenin's letters on Kamenev's and Zinoviev's blackleg actions be discussed at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee.

J. V. Stalin takes part in the first meeting of the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet.

At a meeting of Petrograd trade union representatives in the Smolny, J. V. Stalin speaks on the preparations for armed insurrection.

October 21 J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Party Central Committee which resolves to appoint him and Dzerzhinsky to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet in order to strengthen the influence of the Bolsheviks in it. It adopts Stalin's proposal that reports and theses should be prepared for the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on the land, the war, and the government (speaker, V. I. Lenin), and on the national question (speaker, J. V. Stalin). Stalin and Sverdlov are appointed to direct the Bolshevik group at the congress.

October 24 At 11 a. m., *Rabochy Put* appears with J. V. Stalin's article "What Do We Need?" calling for the overthrow of the Provisional Government.

J. V. Stalin reports on the political situation at a meeting of the Bolshevik delegates to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

In the evening V. I. Lenin arrives at the Smolny. J. V. Stalin informs him of the political developments.

October 24-25 V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin direct the October armed uprising.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

96